

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXL.

JULY , 1893.

THE FUTURE OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY THE REV. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D.

PRESBYTERIANISM in the United States of America derived its life and its principles from the Presbyterian churches of Great Britain. England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales each contributed important factors. The home of Presbyterianism is Scotland, where the national church has been Presbyterian, with the exception of a few decades, since the Protestant Reformation. Presbyterianism in Ulster was of Scottish origin, but it soon assumed a provincial type which it has retained with great tenacity and which the Ulster contingent in America has maintained as if it were the genuine original Presbyterianism. English Presbyterianism had an independent origin through Cartwright, Travers and their associates in the Puritan struggle within the Church of England. The English type of Presbyterianism influenced Wales, Dublin and the south of Ireland.

Presbyterianism derived its name from the ecclesiastical polity and discipline which it advocated over against Prelacy on the one hand and Independency on the other. In the sixteenth century doctrinal differences did not emerge, for the Presbyterians were no more rigid Calvinists than were the Prelatists and the Independents. In the seventeenth century a considerable portion of the Prelatical party became Arminian, but Calvinism always remained a potent factor in the Church of England, entrenched in the Thirty-nine Articles. The Independents in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were more rigid Calvinists than the Presbyterians. The conflicts of Presbyterianism with its foes and the internal conflicts of Presbyterianism itself in Scotland have

VOL. CLVII.—NO. 440.

1

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BAYNE. All rights reserved.

been chiefly ecclesiastical. Few doctrinal conflicts have taken place in Scotland, and these have never wrought division. All of the divisions in Scottish Presbyterianism have resulted from differences in opinion on ecclesiastical questions. Presbyterianism in England gradually wasted away. Under the policy of comprehension, which was maintained by many of the English bishops in the last half of the seventeenth century and in the early part of the eighteenth century, large numbers of Presbyterians returned to the Church of England. The subscription controversy still further weakened them. They maintained Puritan liberty and refused subscription. But this gave the more radical type of Presbyterianism such an advantage that in the course of time the whole English Presbyterian body became Unitarian, so that in England Presbyterianism and Unitarianism are synonymous terms. In Ireland the Anglo-Irish and the Scotch-Irish types came into conflict in the subscription controversy and Presbyterianism was divided. As a resultant of the subscription controversy English Presbyterianism became too broad and Scotch-Irish Presbyterianism too narrow.

Presbyterianism in America resulted from a mingling of all the British types, with the addition of elements from the Reformed churches of France and Switzerland, and a numerous body of New England Congregationalists who, on migrating to the Middle colonies, became Presbyterians in accordance with a policy of non-intrusion, agreed upon by Congregationalists and Presbyterians at that time. Presbyterianism was organized in Philadelphia in the spring of 1706 by Francis Makemie, John Hampton and Samuel Davis, Irishmen; George McNish, a Scotchman, and Jedediah Andrew, John Wilson, and Nathaniel Taylor, New England Puritans. In ten years they increased to eight Scotchmen, seven Irishmen, three Welshmen, and seven New Englanders.

The two great types of Presbyterianism came into conflict upon the question of subscription in 1728. John Thomson, an Ulsterman, introduced an overture in favor of strict subscription to the Westminster standards. This was opposed by New Englanders. But a compromise was effected by the genius of Jonathan Dickinson, who devised a plan of subscription to "all the essential and necessary articles" of the Westminster standards; and to the Presbyterian government and discipline as "agreeable

in substance to the Word of God," to be observed "as near as circumstances will allow and Christian prudence direct."

This fundamental agreement in the act of adoption of the Westminster system lies at the basis of the constitution of the American Presbyterian Church and is the pivot of its history. The strict subscriptionists were not satisfied. They agitated in several of the presbyteries for a narrow interpretation of the Adopting Act. At last they accomplished their purpose in 1741, by taking advantage of an accidental majority, which they obtained by the absence of an unusual number of ministers, especially from the large Presbytery of New York. A synod of forty-seven ministers was broken up by a majority of two in a total vote of twenty-two, and twelve ministers succeeded in casting out eleven. After several years of earnest effort for harmony the Presbytery of New York united with those who had been cast out and organized the Synod of New York, which became known as the New Side over against the Synod of Philadelphia, which was called the Old Side. On the New Side were liberal subscription, considerate discipline, vital piety and aggressive evangelization; on the Old Side were strict discipline, ecclesiastical domination, conformity to rigid types of doctrine and traditional methods of work. The Presbyterian Church at that time was about to unite with the Reformed churches from Holland and Germany, in accordance with the advice of the mother synod. But John Thomson and his eleven associates frustrated a union which might have been of immense advantage to American Christianity, and wrought an unhappy division which disorganized for some years the work of evangelization on the frontiers and among the American Indians.

During the period of separation the Old Side did not prosper; they gained only four ministers, while the New Side grew from 20 to 72 ministers. The reunion in 1758 was accomplished by falling back on the Adopting Act of 1729. It was agreed that the synod should determine only such things as were "indispensable in doctrine and Presbyterian government;" and subscription was limited to the "system of Christian doctrine" of the Westminster standards. The Presbyterian Church thrived from 1758 until 1788 when the General Assembly was organized, the Westminster symbols revised, and the constitution adopted. Terms of subscription were framed which, in accordance with

the Adopting Act of 1729 and the Terms of Union of 1758, limited subscription to the "system of doctrine."

Besides this main stock of Presbyterians, the several non-conforming Presbyterian bodies of Scotland and Ireland established colonies in the United States which, after many subdivisions and reconstructions, resulted in several branches of Reformed Presbyterians and United Presbyterians.

In 1810, by an act of intolerance and wrong to a little body of pious evangelists, the Presbyterian Church provoked a schism of several ministers who organized the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which has grown during the century, in the valley of the Mississippi, into a great Presbyterian organization with a General Assembly and many subordinate synods and presbyteries.

Doctrinal controversies sprang up early in the century in the Presbyterian Church, respecting the extent of the Atonement and the imputation of Adam's sin and of Christ's righteousness; and a New School party was formed over against an Old School party. These parties were simply the renewal of the Old and New sides of the previous century, and indeed of the English and Ulster types of Presbyterianism, under new circumstances and with regard to new questions. Albert Barnes and Lyman Beecher were tried for heresy, and although ultimately acquitted by the General Assembly, yet the Old School was dissatisfied with the verdicts and in 1837 "finding themselves for a second time only within seven years in the majority, took advantage of the occasion to excise simply by an act of power, irrespective of constitutional limitation," four synods with all their churches and ministers. The aggrieved New School held a convention at Auburn in August, 1837, and at the Assembly of 1838 demanded the enrollment of the representatives of the four excised synods. When this was refused two Assemblies were organized, the Old School and the New School. These continued apart until 1870. During the War of the Rebellion each school threw off the Southern synods. These organized the Southern Presbyterian Church, which still continues its independent life. The Old School and New School Assemblies united in 1870 on the basis of the Constitution of 1788 with an understanding of mutual respect and toleration to both sides on all matters which had been in contention. This reunion did not remove differences in spirit, in doctrine, or in ecclesiastical principles. The two parties were united

in one comprehensive church instead of remaining apart in different organizations.

There was an era of peace and good will which lasted about a decade, when strife again broke out between the same old parties. The aggressive minority again strove to impose their provincial theology and their ecclesiastical domination upon the whole Church. Several trials for heresy and for irregularity were held in different parts of the Church, which were not regarded as sufficiently important to rally the parties in battle array. The Swing case in Chicago, the McCune case in Cincinnati, and other lesser cases in New Jersey, Pennsylvania and elsewhere, were regarded by the New School as breaches of faith on the part of the Old School; but they were patiently endured in the hope that better feelings and actions would ultimately prevail. A greater peril came when the united Review, after the death of Henry B. Smith, passed into the hands of those who were not sensitive to the delicacy of the situation, but the misunderstanding was removed by the establishment of the *Presbyterian Review* in which all the theological seminaries were proportionately represented. It was evident that the reactionary party were becoming more and more aggressive, and it needed only the emergence of some great questions to rally them to a new act of ecclesiastical domination. In the meanwhile the liberal party became more and more discouraged, and large numbers of ministers and laymen sought refuge especially in Congregational and Episcopal churches, and the conservative party became constantly more ambitious as it captured one after another of the strong pulpits of the New School party, and secured the control of all the Presbyterian newspapers, with the single exception of the *New York Evangelist*.

The Revision movement, which burst forth from the people without any ecclesiastical leadership, took the Presbyterian Church by surprise and threw the conservative party into a panic. It was the last straw which broke the back of the combination of interests in the *Presbyterian Review* and brought about its dissolution. The conservatives rallied about a new Review, and then by shrewd management at Saratoga in 1890 gained control of the committee appointed to revise the Confession. They then recommended such minor and trivial revisions as failed to satisfy the demands of the revisionists. Ac-

cordingly liberals and conservatives united in defeating the proposed revisions, and the Revision movement came to a halt in the last General Assembly at Washington. The revisionists were divided into two bands; the one seeking relief by amendment of the Confession, the other by a new and simple creed. The latter were called by the reactionaries radical revisionists. The two bands of revisionists worked together until the Assembly at Saratoga. There the conservatives succeeded in dividing them with the aim of destroying them in detail. The dissatisfaction with the revision offered by the compromisers greatly increased the numbers of those who desire a new creed; so that the Revision movement has now passed over into a movement for a new creed. But this movement was not strong enough to gain recognition from the ultra-conservatives, who held the General Assembly at Washington entirely in their power. It is evident, however, that the movement for a new creed will increase in impetus until in 1894 or 1895 the ultra-conservatives will be forced to yield to it, and there will be another effort made by ecclesiastical politicians to stoop to conquer. They will probably go so far in the movement as to gain the control of it; and then so direct it as to render it inoperative and unsuccessful. They will probably succeed in these tactics, as they have just succeeded in destroying the Revision movement. Then will come a movement which the ecclesiastics will be unable to control—a strong, irresistible demand of a deceived and oft-betrayed ministry and people, for such a revision of the terms of subscription as will make it evident to all the world that a man of the most scrupulous conscience may adhere to the Westminster symbols as the historic monuments of the Presbyterian Church without risking his manhood under the ecclesiastical domination of an ultra-conservative faction which may think that it can dominate the faith of the Church, or force from the Church of their fathers by accidental and worked up majorities ministers more truly orthodox than themselves.

The attention of the ministry and people of the Presbyterian Church has been withdrawn from the movement in behalf of a new creed by a band of ecclesiastics who have thrown them into a panic about the Bible because of the Inaugural Address of Professor Briggs on the Authority of Holy Scripture, delivered January 20, 1891. That address, as is well known, did not

promulgate new and strange doctrines. The doctrines stated in that address are but the summary statements of the doctrines which Professor Briggs had been teaching for many years, and which had been before the public for several years in his several printed books, such as *Biblical Study, American Presbyterianism, Messianic Prophecy, Whither*; and in numerous articles in the *Presbyterian Review*, which were condoned by the Presbyterian Church, even if they were regarded as erroneous, during all that time in which Professor Briggs was joint editor of that *Review* with Dr. A. A. Hodge and Dr. F. L. Patton. There was nothing in the Inaugural Address as such which could have excited such a panic, if it had not been so misinterpreted and misquoted by partisan Presbyterian newspapers, and by reactionary ecclesiastics to mislead and deceive the Presbyterian ministry and people, especially in the outlying districts and in the more remote regions of the country.

It is quite true that the Inaugural Address and the other writings mentioned raise many important theological questions which seem new, startling and dangerous to those who have been trained in the traditional theology, and who have not kept in touch with the modern scientific study of the Bible and of Church History. But to those who know the currents of theological thought in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe, it seems surprising that the great Presbyterian Church should have been thrown into a panic by such an address. The panic has accomplished the purpose of those who excited it, and Professor Briggs has been suspended from the Presbyterian ministry for teaching doctrines which "strike at the vitals of religion." These doctrines are the following: (1) The Bible, the Church and the Reason are historically three great fountains of divine authority; (2) There may have been errors in the original autographs of Holy Scripture; (3) Moses did not write the Pentateuch, and Isaiah did not write half the book which bears his name; (4) There is progressive sanctification in the middle state between death and the resurrection. These doctrines are beyond the range of those defined in the Westminster Confession, are extra-confessional, and within the area of the liberty guaranteed by the constitution of the Church. And yet the General Assembly at Washington by a great majority declared them to be errors which "strike at the vitals of religion," and for holding and teaching

them Professor Briggs was suspended from the Presbyterian ministry.

If the General Assembly had the power to determine the faith of the Presbyterian Church by such a decision it would put all liberal Presbyterians in a serious situation, in which they would either be obliged to submit to these decisions or else to retire from the Presbyterian ministry. But a General Assembly has no such power. It cannot determine the faith of the Church either by deliverance of opinion or by judicial condemnation of a minister. The constitution prescribes the way in which the faith of the Church may be determined, namely, by the agreement of two-thirds of the presbyteries to a statement of doctrine submitted to them by the General Assembly. Therefore the only effect of the suspension of Professor Briggs, for the reasons assigned, is that his doctrines are declared to be hurtful errors by the majority of the last Assembly. But the minority of that Assembly, who have declared that his doctrines are not hurtful errors, have a legal right to hold those opinions, and to contend for them until they are declared to be hurtful errors by amendments of the Confession of Faith.

Furthermore, the minority contend that the Assembly at Washington was guilty of usurpation of power and of ecclesiastical domination of the same general character as the act of John Thomson and his eleven associates in 1741, and of the General Assembly of 1837. For the General Assembly violated the constitution of the Church and all the precedents of Presbyterian practice in these three respects: (1) It recognized the right of a public prosecutor to appeal against a verdict of acquittal; (2.) It recognized that a committee appointed by the Presbytery of New York was independent of the Presbytery which appointed it; (3.) It usurped the jurisdiction of the Synod of New York by assuming jurisdiction of a case which was under the jurisdiction of the Synod of New York and not yet determined by that synod. These unconstitutional acts of the Assembly at Washington have not yet been recognized by the Synod of New York, and until the synod has yielded its jurisdiction and officially given its consent to these actions of the General Assembly, the minority of the Assembly are legally justified in declining to submit to them.

A General Assembly is not a permanent body. It has no con-

tinuous life. It is composed of representatives of the presbyteries who meet together for a few days and then dissolve forever. One, two or three General Assemblies in succession may usurp power, may do grave injustice, may make breaches in the constitution of the Church. But all these wrongs may be righted by a fourth or a fifth, or any subsequent Assembly. There are numerous examples of such things in the history of Presbyterianism. The minority of the last Assembly and those who agree with them throughout the Presbyterian Church are therefore justified in the continuation of the struggle for liberty, for truth, and for right.

The majority of votes in favor of the suspension was very great. But if the votes are weighed as well as counted the disparity will not be regarded as serious. The basis of representation in the General Assembly gives the small presbyteries in the country districts and on the frontiers a vastly greater power than they are entitled to by their numbers or influence, while the strong presbyteries in our large cities and in the great communities are put at a serious disadvantage. The General Assemblies as they are now constituted represent the least intelligent portion of the Church, and not infrequently a majority in the Assembly really represents a minority of the ministers and people in the denomination. A majority of a General Assembly is not taken seriously by intelligent Presbyterians.

The only danger of another disruption in the Presbyterian Church at present is in such an assumption of power on the part of another Assembly as would by an act of violence exclude at a blow large numbers of ministers and people from the Presbyterian Church. Such action is improbable. It is probable that there will be a series of heresy trials for several years until the ultra-conservatives exhaust themselves and tire the patience of the Church, when there will be a reaction so strong, so sweeping, so irresistible in its demands for breadth of thought, liberty of scholarship, intelligent appropriation of the wealth of modern science and the efficiency of modern methods of work, that the reactionaries will be swept all at once and forever into insignificance. The onset of modern scholarship and of scientific methods of study and of work is as steady and sweeping as the march of a glacier. It grinds to powder everything that obstructs its path. The Presbyterian Church will probably not be seriously

injured by it; but the ultra-conservative party in the Presbyterian Church will be crushed by it in due time.

All American churches are in the stream of that tendency which is rushing on towards the unity of Christ's Church. The hedges which separate the denominations are traditional theories and practices; but they are no longer realities to thinking and working men and women. The liberals of every denomination of Christians are more in accord with one another than they are with the conservatives in their own denominations. The problem in the near future is this: Can the liberals remain in comfort in their several denominations and so become the bridges of Church Unity; or will they be forced to unite in a comprehensive frame of Church Unity outside the existing denominations; or will they rally around the more liberal communions? There seems to be little doubt that the liberals at the present time are quite comfortable as Episcopalians and as Congregationalists, and not altogether uncomfortable as Baptists and as Methodists, and that there is no other denomination in which they are so uncomfortable as in the Presbyterian Church. It is possible that they may, after a year or more of battle for liberty, be compelled to retire from the existing Presbyterian Church and abandon it to a traditional, unscholarly and fossilized majority; and then organize a liberal Presbyterian Church as has been done twice before in this country. But this is not probable at the present time. The liberals will still continue to make themselves as comfortable as possible during the brief period of theological war, until a final struggle may determine their destiny. They will go on in theological investigation; they will continue the study of the higher criticism of Holy Scripture; they will seek more light upon the dark problems of the future of the earth and man; they will continue to seek God through the Church and the Reason as well as through the Bible; they will remain the great constitutional party; they will be patient, brave, painstaking and heroic, until the Presbyterian Church becomes as broad, catholic and progressive as her Congregational and Episcopal sisters; and then Church Unity will be nigh, at the doors, and a happy end of controversy will be seen in a united Protestantism, which will be then encouraged to seek a higher and grander unity, in which the Roman and Greek communions will likewise share.

C. A. BRIGGS.

DIVORCE MADE EASY.

BY PROF. SAMUEL J. BRUN.

IN THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for December, 1892, M. Naquet, a member of the French Chamber of Deputies and father of the French divorce law of 1884, has an article on divorce in which he not only defends the bill of 1884 but regrets that his countrymen are not ripe enough for more liberal legislation on that subject. His words leave no room for doubt in the mind of the reader as to the breadth of the writer's view on that particular topic. "My convictions on this subject," he says, "are so well established that, if I did not fear the reaction to which popular ignorance might give birth, I would not hesitate, if in my power to do so, to remove every obstacle in the way of divorce." And with M. Bertillon he takes the ground—to use the very words of Colonel Wright, of the Bureau of Labor—"that legislation of a kind which extends the causes for or facilitates the procedure in divorce cases has no marked influence upon the increase of the number of decrees granted." If, for instance, the only ground for seeking divorce was the breaking on the part of one of the contracting parties of the seventh commandment, the number of decrees granted would average the same as if divorce could be sought and obtained on the grounds of desertion, failure to provide, cruel treatment, habitual drunkenness, or for any of the grounds on which the courts may deem it sufficient to render their decrees severing the bonds of matrimony. Mr. Wright, in his chapter on the influence of legislation, in his report on marriages and divorce, expresses no definite belief on the subject, although his studies along this line are extensive.

Surprised, however, at the sudden increase of divorces in France since the bill of 1884 became a law, M. Naquet hints that there will soon be a decrease in the numbers of applications for divorce. Switzerland is named by him as an instance of a country where, after the first few years, there was a marked decrease in the number of applications and decrees granted. The fact is, however, that Switzerland has a rather loose law of divorce—certainly more liberal than the French law—its courts being empow-

ered to grant their decrees if the marriage relation seems to be greatly strained. In Switzerland the ratio of divorced couples to the thousand marriages was, for the period of 1877-81, 48.06 per cent., and for the period of 1882-86, 45.09 per cent., which is certainly not such a falling off as to warrant the assumption that decrees will decrease in France.

I think history proves that applications for divorce increase as the law becomes more and more liberal; and in this connection it may be interesting to go back to French legislation on that subject in 1792. In that year France made the experiment of changing the conception of marriage by substituting a covenant practically at will for a covenant for life. By that law, as then enacted, divorces were granted in France for nine causes, and one of the grounds was allegation of incompatibility of temper or character by either of the spouses. This ground on which divorce proceedings could be based worked like a charm; so that, according to M. Glasson, during the twenty-seven months following the promulgation of the law of 1792, 6,000 divorces in Paris alone were granted, and for the year 1797 the divorces actually outnumbered the marriages.

The historian Duval, in his *Souvenirs Thermidoriens*, has a passage which graphically depicts the state of society with respect to marriage and divorce. It is found on pages 60-61 of Volume I., which I condense. He says :

"Couples divorced for a 'yes,' for a 'no;' they divorced under the least provocation; they divorced without provocation, without any more ado than they would have made to go and gather lilacs in the meadows of Saint Gervais or to eat cherries at Montmorency. . . . There was an especial article in the law which opened wide the door to libertine husbands and debauched wives. I refer to the one which allowed divorce for incompatibility of temper. The husband might have a mistress and be tired of his wife. The wife might have a lover and would like nothing better than to get rid of her husband. They mutually informed each other of their respective affairs, left together for the city hall, informed the mayor they could no longer bear each other, and on that day or the following day the divorce was granted for incompatibility as to temper. And the children, what became of them? What did it matter? The spouses were freed the one from the other; the most important thing was done.

"And it was not a rare thing, on account of the ease with which divorces could be obtained, to find couples who had been divorced five or six times in as many months. Sometimes very ludicrous things happened. Once two couples were acting like La Fontaine's *Troqueurs*, which means that they were making an exchange amongst themselves—trading husbands and wives—and the quartette were so well agreed that the double wedding repast was had at common expense at L'Arc-en-ciel Boulevard de l'Hôpital.

"A saddler living in Paris after divorcing his wife had become a municipal officer. One day while on duty for the performance of marriage ceremonies at the city hall, his former wife entered to be married again. That seemed to be somewhat strange to him. But what was his surprise when he recognized in the person of the groom L'Abbe Hervier, a priest of Saint Eustache, who had formerly given them the nuptial blessing. He, however, made them husband and wife without departing in any way from his municipal seriousness."

French legislators became alarmed at the steady increase in the number of divorces, and in 1798 an amendatory act was passed restricting somewhat the provisions of the law of 1792, and enacting that every ten years all teachers of public and private schools were to take their pupils to the public square and then and there to make proclamation of the divorced couples during the previous decade, thereby trying to check the evil by giving it the stigma of public disgrace. M. Naquet, and those who think as he does on this subject, may contend that these were abnormal times. Let us then study the same question in the United States through a period covering the years 1866-86, in time of peace, in a country where temples are not erected by the State to the Goddess Reason, where schools and churches abound, and amongst a people which claims to be religious.

The laws of the different States of the Union do not countenance such a clause on which to pin a divorce as "incompatibility of temper;" but with the exception of South Carolina, which has no divorce law, and New York, which has only one ground for the granting of divorce, all the States of the Union grant divorces on the ground of cruel and inhuman treatment, in addition to the usual statutory grounds. Now, during that period, while the population has increased about 60 per cent. divorces have increased 157 per cent. In 1867 the total reach was 9,937 divorces, and in the year 1886 it had risen to 25,535, which is an increase of nearly 157 per cent. in twenty years, and the grand total of divorces granted is 328,716.

To be sure, divorces were not granted for a "yes" or a "no," or for incompatibility of temper, but they were granted under that much abused clause of "inhuman and cruel treatment." And it is quite interesting to see what constitutes inhuman and cruel treatment. I take examples at random from the Report of the Commissioner of Labor for 1889. In one case a court grants a divorce to the wife because the defendant, the husband, does not

wash himself. In another case, the defendant, the husband, has accused the plaintiff's sister of stealing. In one case a divorce is granted to plaintiff, the wife, because her old husband, to whom she had been married twenty-seven years, says to her : " You are old and worn-out ; I do not want you any more." In another case, whilst the plaintiff, the wife, was sick in bed, the defendant said to her that he meant to commit suicide and then and there drank a bottle of paregoric, which was a means of great mental worryment and anxiety to the plaintiff, and the court severed the bonds of matrimony.

A very unique case is that where plaintiff, who is subject to sick headaches which grow worse when she smells tobacco, is granted a divorce because her husband smokes. In another case the plaintiff is granted a divorce from her husband because he insists on quoting to her passages of the Scriptures, and reminding her in the language of the Apostle Paul that she is to be obedient to her husband. But perhaps the oddest is the case where defendant writes to plaintiff as follows : " There is a woman here whom I think I could love. If you love me, Mary, or if you have ever loved me, you will do me the kindness to sue for a divorce as soon as possible." And Mary, who loves him, or may have loved him, asks and of course obtains a divorce. In one case defendant writes to plaintiff that he is dead. She orders a mourning garb, but soon finds out that he is alive. Instead of rejoicing over her lost treasure, she asks and obtains a divorce.

Forty-five thousand seven hundred and thirty-one divorces were granted to wives against their husbands in twenty years for what is termed " extreme cruelty," and some samples have just been given. Husbands, however, are not so lucky, for they got only 6,122 decrees in the same period, which is certainly an outrage, judging from the treatment they must receive at the hands of their spouses, if the following cases are fair samples : A poor husband appears in court and complains that the wife refuses to keep his clothing in repair and to sew on his buttons. He is corroborated by the testimony of one witness who says that he has seen plaintiff with only one button on his vest. The court grants the divorce. In another case the plaintiff receives a violent blow from his wife administered to him with her bustle ; and in still another case the wife pulls plaintiff out of bed by his whiskers.

Here is a case which came under the writer's observation. A

few months ago a Christian minister was called upon to unite in the holy bonds of matrimony a couple who were yet young in years but old veterans in hymeneal unions. A few years before they had been married, but the young husband, pinched for means, committed a forgery, was arrested, tried and sentenced to the penitentiary. His better half, who had married him for "better or for worse," hastened, of course, to get a divorce and to marry again. He served his time, discarded his prison garb, and being a free man contracted a new marriage. But the second spouse did not meet his expectations; he found his yoke unbearable; he asked for and obtained a divorce. Meanwhile his first wife was not idle. Her ideal was not realized in her second spouse, and she set the machinery of the law in motion and a few days made her free again, cured forever, as we might suppose, from "entangling alliances." Not so, however. Her first husband, knowing her free, came back, wooed and won her again, and they were married, receiving the congratulations of their friends.

That life is short is no longer true; for here is a couple yet under forty with two divorces apiece, and three marriages on the credit side of their lives. If they live to the allotted time of which the Psalmist speaks, they have ample time to contract half a dozen more experimental marriages. If this is not a travesty on holy wedlock, what is?

So we see that both in the stormy days of France, a hundred years ago and more, and in the halcyon days of American prosperity in the last half of the nineteenth century, loose divorce laws accelerate divorces instead of, as M. Naquet hopes, diminishing them.

It is also contended—and that is the great argument—that divorces encourage morality. If that be the case to-day in the United States, which have the loosest divorce laws, most loosely interpreted by the courts, of any nation in the world—where parties can marry and remarry at will, and exchange partners at pleasure—there ought to be a great falling off in the birth of illegitimate children. As a matter of fact, if we compare England with her strict divorce law, and France before the law of 1884 with the United States, we find that in England only 54 illegitimate children are born per thousand; in France 74 per thousand, and in the United States 70 per thousand, which is certainly not a very great showing in favor of the last named country, taking

everything into consideration—the ease with which marriages can be contracted and divorces obtained.

Now, I contend that legislation is responsible for the state of affairs as they now exist in the United States. For what is legislation?—the will of the majority? Yes and no. In some particular cases it is not. We know that many a law is enacted by the representatives of the people without their constituents ever clamoring for such a law, and France is no exception to that rule. Who does not know, for instance, that the bill of 1884 did not become a law until M. Naquet had urged its passage before two or three parliaments, and that it required all his persistence, his great skill, his persuasive eloquence, to bring the majority of the members of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate to his view before the bill became a law? Who does not know, for instance, that many a law is passed in the different legislatures of the Union simply because one or two members are directly interested in it? It is an old story; a member is directly interested in legislation. He has had occasion to give what may be termed a complimentary vote to some of his fellow legislators. In their turn they are ready to pay back the compliment. The bill is harmless. It touches not the pocket of the taxpayer. They vote for it. It becomes a law. So long as it works no sudden or crying mischief it is suffered to remain on the statute books. And so with the different divorce laws; they are not at the start a result of popular clamor for their passage but of the accommodations legislators give to the parties interested in them.

It is said, for example, that in New York State, where the guilty party in a divorce proceeding could not under a former law remarry, a law was passed at the very instance of a member of the legislature—a divorcee directly interested—permitting the guilty party to remarry.

Once divorce laws are enacted, married couples take advantage of them who would never have thought or dreamed of separating and would have patched up their quarrels and differences if there had not been such an easy way out of the matrimonial bond. No man would have ever thought, unless the law favored a loose way out of wedlock, to write: "Mary, if you love me, or ever did love me, you will apply for a divorce, as there is another woman whom I could love."

As the scope of the law is little by little enlarged, an increas-

ing number seek and obtain divorces, and after a while it becomes a perfectly respectable thing to contract what might be termed experimental marriages. In the West, especially, society receives back *divorcees*. The palaces of the well-to-do are open to them. Churches do not cast them out, and ministers welcome them at their communion tables. They may occupy positions of trust and honor, two or three divorces to their credit side notwithstanding.

And we are told that such sights have no influence on the growing generation of boys and girls. This is not true. Teach the rising generation by object-lessons at an age when impressions are deep and lasting, that men and women may, without losing caste, divorce at pleasure, and the notion of the sanctity of the family life is undermined. Let the newspapers dish up to the public, as they invariably do, all the details of divorce proceedings and joke about them, and the sanctity and morality of the family must necessarily be sapped.

It is not a hundred years since the guillotine numbered its victims on the Place de la Révolution in Paris. Lavallée, the historian, in his *Histoire de Paris*, speaking of the crimes committed in Liberty's name, says :

"The old régime by the number and facility of its criminal executions had given but too much to the people a taste for blood, for torture ; and the sight of the gibbet, of the wheel, of the scaffold daily given to the Parisians under the monarchy was not without its influence on the bloody scenes of the Revolution."

If blood called for more blood, why should not the daily sight and daily perusal of scandalous divorce proceedings change and demoralize our conception of marriage ?

The total number of children involved in twenty years of these divorce proceedings reaches 267,739, and in 141,810 cases the records do not show whether there was any issue of the couples before the courts. Over a quarter of a million children had their homes broken, and went to fill the ranks of those who believe in divorce as a remedy.

We are told that crimes are on the increase. The student of Sociology may, perhaps, find in the study of the relations of divorce to crime both the cause and the effect.

SAMUEL J. BRUN.

IRELAND AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

BY THE RIGHT HON. THE COUNTESS OF ABERDEEN.

IT is a wonderful creation, that city of white palaces amongst the gleaming waters and waving verdure, at which the people of the New World are calling the nations of the earth to assemble, and where we may wander for long hours amidst the marvels of art and industry and science and nature, gathered from every land. And it is but fitting that this great Exposition, which seeks to represent every phase of life on the earth, should not only invite to her halls the wise, the great, the eloquent, the learned and the leaders of the peoples together in order to demonstrate the common brotherhood of all mankind, but that, hard by her palaces, we should find a place set apart where the common, every-day life of all sorts and conditions of men of various nations of the world may be witnessed by the most stay-at-home of Americans.

And, if we mistake not, many of the visitors to the World's Fair, who are also lovers of human nature, will own to themselves that they have carried away more vivid remembrances of the doings and ways of men and nations as illustrated on the Midway Plaisance, than even of their most wonderful handiwork as seen in the show-cases of the great buildings.

In this common camping-ground we may betake ourselves to one of the temples of ancient Egypt, hundreds of years before Christ; we may become explorers of Central Africa and the huts of the Soudanese, enlivened by the tom-toms of the comely black musicians, or we may watch the jesters and the jugglers of the East, still puzzling, with their tricks, the magicians of the West. Or we can turn from all the brilliant coloring and gay wares shown us by the Chinese and Japanese, to find ourselves amongst the quaint little Esquimaux and Laplanders, who, perhaps, seem most out of place amidst all this sun and radiance. Or, again, we may wander amongst the savage tribes of the South Sea Islands; or, if we will, we may spend our summer afternoons doz-

ing under a tree listening to martial music amidst surroundings which must make us wake with a start to wonder if we are, indeed, subjects of the Kaiser Wilhelm.

And to what end have all these shows and sights been brought here at such vast trouble and expense? Many nations have doubtless combined to bring about this panorama. Not only have the promoters of the World's Fair desired to see it as complete in every detail as possible, but no nation was willing to be unrepresented here, or to lose a chance of participating in the spoils to be expected as the result of this peaceful contest of competition.

But it is of the why and wherefore of one little settlement at the very head of the Midway Plaisance that I would speak, and of the reasons that make those who are responsible for its erection believe that its bare, grey old tower and its little, white-washed, thatched cottages will appeal even more powerfully to thousands of American citizens than the brilliant hues and gorgeous displays of more ostentatious spectacles. Yes; for it is here that "the distressful country" lifts high her green flag from the battlements of Blarney and calls on the sons and daughters of Erin to show proof that a surpassing love for the old country and for all that reminds them of her is a part of their inheritance which they have not yet lost; and we shall be greatly mistaken if any who boast of Irish blood in their veins do not resort thither with their children in order to call to mind the stories told by parents of the scenes of their childhood, or muse over bygone days which they themselves can recall in the dear old home, surrounded by a mother's love and a father's blessing, and all those recollections, whether of joy or sorrow, which tend to forge lasting ties between those of the same kindred and the same country. The architects who designed and carried out the plan have striven to give a faithful and truthful representation of the scenes they seek to depict.

Blarney Castle is an exact reproduction (on a scale of two-thirds) of the stronghold of the old McCarthys. The entrance, copied from Cormac chapel at the Rock of Cashel, and the Cloisters of Muckross, are from drawings taken on the spot, and each cottage is the copy of an actual cottage now existing in some part of Ireland. The scant, but durable furniture; the old dressers and settles and stools are copied from special designs; the

iron pots, the old delft ornaments, all hail from home, and the bog-turf!—inhale its fragrance! If you know it not, your feet have never pressed the Irish sod. And many another small trace of Irish life will be recognized by the initiated, not to speak of the sounds of the harp, the national instrument, wafting forth national airs in response to the touch of an Irish patriot's daughter; the pipes calling forth the dance and the jig, and Irish voices making the air melodious with the wild and pathetic strains of Irish song.

But it is in the actual dwellers and workers in the village that the interest will chiefly concentrate, for whatever may be the defects in the imitations we have made of inanimate things these newly imported lads and lasses show their origin plainly enough, with their rosy cheeks—the tint of which some doubting American visitors have been rash enough to hint must be artificial—and their deft hands plying needle or loom or wheel or carving-tools with equal dexterity. If it is impossible absolutely to represent a quiet and peaceful cottage life in the wilds of Ireland in a place where thousands of visitors pass daily, yet this comes as near the original as circumstances will permit, and we believe that the remembrances of the past which the sight will recall, with the aspirations which it will renew of being a credit and an honor to the old people, the old home, the old country in this new world, in whose history and life the Irish element counts for so much—these remembrances and aspirations must be full of wholesomeness and help.

But was it merely the purpose of inspiring such sentiments, noble as they may be, that induced the “Irish Industries Association” to set down this little industrial colony in the World's Fair, at the cost of considerable trouble and at the risk of many thousands of dollars advanced for the purpose by kind friends both in the old country and in America? No. The mission intrusted to us by the people of Ireland, represented as they are in our councils by persons of all classes, all denominations of religion, and all sections of politics, is one of wide and practical importance to the poor of Ireland, and not only has it been taken heartily in hand by our Committee but it has been enthusiastically indorsed by many public meetings in different parts of Ireland. We not only desire to represent the life of some of Ireland's peasantry, but we desire to appeal

through their skill and quickness and dexterity to Ireland's friends and to show that through these qualities a great work can be done for Ireland.

What has been the reason for the great decrease in the population of Ireland? What has been her curse, apart from (although in great measure owing to) England's misgovernment? Is it not that her people have mainly relied on the land for their sustenance, and that any bad season or other mischance has found them with no other means of living to resort to? And so they have had to face one of two alternatives: practical starvation at home or emigration. And this amongst a people who not only have an intense love of home, but who appear naturally to possess industrial aptitude, calculated to make their country prosperous! Need these things be? Although the new countries of the West are goodly lands of hope for the emigrant, yet need Ireland be depopulated yearly of the flower of her young men and maidens who cling to home and parents despite all hardships and scanty fare, and who part from their country with a sore wrench never wholly forgotten throughout life? And all the while there is running to waste not only the manual dexterity referred to, but a whole treasury of water-power, and seas teeming with fish.

Both political parties have seemed to recognize these facts of late, and we gratefully acknowledge the good likely to be done by Mr. Balfour's light railways in opening up the country and the action of the Congested District's Board, and the development of the dairy industry. Those of us who are Home-Rulers are inclined, however, to believe that Ireland's full industrial development can only come under a complete system of self government, and under that self government we look forward to a golden future, though it may be attained but slowly and through many difficulties. But be that as it may, we who believe in that golden future are bound to strain every nerve to prepare the people for it, and so it will be seen that in this work of promoting the industries of the country persons of the most widely differing opinions (so long as they be lovers of their country) can meet together and strive together for a common end, however diverse may be their expectations and desires regarding the future. It is thus that during the past seven years the Irish Industries Association has been seeking to promote and develop the very beginnings of all industries likely to become permanent, and so to

train the workers that they may be able by and by to meet the demands of the trade so soon as regular trade connections can be made for them.

We believe that although machinery has transformed the whole face of the country, yet there is still a place for the manufactures of the hand which machinery can never displace, and that the proper organization and development of these is full of moral as well as material good to the country that possesses them.

In the north of Ireland the shirt-making and underclothing industries are fully developed in connection with the trade, agents being distributed throughout the country who give out and receive back the work, untold comforts to hundreds and hundreds of families being the result. The knitting industry is in many places organized on the samelines, and though the wages seem to us horribly low, the people walk for miles to obtain the work. We now desire to foster other home industries in other parts of Ireland, hopeful of like consequences. The lace and crochet industries set on foot mostly during famine years are already well known and appreciated, and offer a hopeful field for further development, and we appeal to lovers of lace and embroideries in America to examine our productions in this direction both in the village and in the Woman's Building, where finished specimens of our work are on view. The Roman Catholic prelates of America have been most generous in giving us orders for vestments and allowing us to exhibit them along with some of our ecclesiastical laces. We are earnestly desirous that their example may be followed by others of the clergy, and by those who propose to make offerings of such articles, as well as by ladies who desire laces for personal adornment, and who may have been misled as to the character of Irish laces by the quality of those wretched specimens offered for sale by the hawkers who come on board the Atlantic liners at Queenstown. Irish lace has often suffered by the pooriness of its design, and by the want of knowledge of both art and fashion by those under whose guidance it has been made.

Much has been done to remedy these deficiencies by various efforts during recent years. Innumerable touching stories can be told of heroic and far-seeing work being accomplished for the poor in these country districts by one kind-hearted lady or another, in many cases working single-handed, and in others in connection with some religious order. During the last few years the prosecu-

tion and teaching of such industries in convent schools have received much impetus from the wise action of Sir Patrick Keenan and the Board of National Education, who have invited the teachers to instruct their higher classes in industrial work instead of adhering to the purely literary curriculum, and who give them fees for so doing. Good results are already springing from this policy, notably so in the case of the woollen weaving established at Foxford, and the linen weaving at Skibbereen and Queenstown.

But the difficulty which has confronted all such local industrial work has been its isolation, its distance from the market, its want of knowledge of the coming needs of the world of fashion in London and Paris and New York. And yet these difficulties have to be overcome; the newest shapes, the best designs, the most modern colors must all be studied and carried out by these peasants in the wilds of Ireland if our modern hand-workers are to secure and maintain their hold on the market. Here comes in the need of outside help, such as our Association aims to give to industries in their early days, and in the diversified form in which we find them, whether under the charge of one person or a committee; whether the outcome of private enterprise, or in the hands of an industrial or convent school as the centre. We aim at backing up all such efforts and at supplying teaching and designs to the workers, and also at providing a market for their goods. We have already made some advance in our objects—we have familiarized the public of Great Britain with Irish work, its variety, and its beauty; we have established shops and held sales which have been the means of disposing of a large quantity of work annually; we have been able to obtain trade orders which have kept many and many poor persons from want during hard seasons. But our work is only beginning—we need teachers, designers, commercial travelers, organizers and training-schools; we want capital wherewith to make grants of money and material to young industries; we want to start others, such as poultry-raising and the raising of early flowers and vegetables. Money is wanted for all these things and, therefore, we are endeavoring to obtain a regular income by enrolling a large number of new members in our Association, both at home and in America, who will show their full sympathy with our work by regularly subscribing \$1 or \$2 a year to it; and who will promote the use of

such Irish manufactures as they may deem worthy of encouragement.

Need our objects in planting the Irish village at Chicago be further inquired into? We seek to remind not only the Irish-Americans but the American public generally of the work of the Irish peasantry; we desire to secure not only their custom, but their hearty support of the movement in its development; and we are sanguine that we shall not appeal in vain for what we confidently believe will largely tend to the uplifting of a whole country.

ISHBEL ABERDEEN.

HOW DISTRUST STOPS TRADE.

BY EDWARD ATKINSON.

THE population of this country is now approaching 68,000,000. That will be our number before the end of the year. The product of the people of this country is not less than what an average of \$200 worth would come to per head; probably more now. It came to that sum about ten years since. This product consists of food, fuel, clothing, and shelter. All work, whether manual, mechanical or ornamental; all capital, whether material or mental; all effort of every name and nature, is expended directly or through the use of capital in the process of bringing out or producing the substances which are derived from the field, the forest or the mine, and converting them into food, fuel, shelter, and clothing. The final cost of the support of each member of the community is his own proportion of the consumption of these products; no more, no less. All that each one gets, rich or poor, is his board and clothing. Consumption is the end of the whole effort, whether it takes the form of what is called fixed capital—in which form it is consumed slowly—or something else for immediate use which is consumed quickly.

Manufacturing and trade consist in converting crude products into their final forms—ready for consumption. In these processes a small part of what is produced is consumed by those who are directly occupied in primary production on farms. The rest—by far the greater part—is converted, re-converted, and sold or exchanged once, twice, thrice, or even more times.

If sixty-eight million persons produce at the rate of \$200 worth per head, which comes to \$600 to each worker upon whom two others depend, then the average product of each workingman or woman upon whom two others depend, at \$600 worth of product per year of three hundred working days, comes to \$2 worth per day; from which two dollars' worth all profits, taxes, and earnings or wages are alike derived or recovered. The aggregate amount, at two dollars' worth each per day, would be meas-

ured in money at the sum of \$13,600,000,000, and that would be the value of our total annual product.

If we take a maximum estimate of that which is consumed where it is produced without purchase or sale, and call it \$1,600,000,000—which is too much—there remains \$12,000,000,000 worth of product which is converted, re-converted, sold or exchanged from one to many times in its progress from the producer to the consumer. The subjects of trade come to at least \$12,000,000,000 a year, probably to a much larger sum.

The lowest average of exchanges may be put at three conversions, each of which carries with it a purchase and a sale. The sum of all transactions comes, therefore, to not less in each year than \$36,000,000,000. Omit holidays and Sundays, and the bargains and sales of each day amount, at least, to \$100,000,000. Divide this by sixty-eight million people, and we find that the purchases and sales which are conducted in terms of money every day for each person, man, woman or child of our population, come to \$1.50, probably to a greater sum.

That is to say, every average man, woman and child must have on the average—some more and some less—what fifty or sixty cents a day will buy. Before this food, fuel and clothing get to the place where each one can buy it, it has been sold once, twice, thrice and sometimes four or five times over, and the sales and purchases come to one dollar and fifty cents a day at these estimates.

Trade consists in making these purchases and sales. Bad money stops trade; then the poorest suffer the most.

In order that food, fuel, clothing and shelter shall reach the person who needs it on the day when he needs it, the product of the farm, the field and the mine must have been moved to the mill, to the workshop, to the factory, to the dwelling; a large part must have been converted into fabrics; these again into clothing, implements and food ready for consumption; lastly, all must be distributed in small parcels in order to reach the person who is to be served. Many would starve if the food were stopped for a week; all would be speedily reduced to want if fuel, clothing and shelter were not supplied at the time of need. These exchanges are "Trade." In trade men serve each other's wants. Commerce exists only by mutual service. Let us reverse the terms of this problem.

Many who cannot think in millions can think in dollars. Let every one think of what quantities of food, fuel and clothing he can buy with fifty cents. The working group numbers three persons; one works for the other two. Let any one think how much food, fuel and clothing for three persons he can pay for out of a dollar and a half per day. Let him then think where the food, the fibres and the fabrics were first produced—where they were manufactured and how they reached the shop where he buys them. Will he not be very certain that before he bought these goods at retail they had already been bought and sold in one form or another, once, twice, three times or more?

Suppose we say three times, then the purchases and sales for each person come to a dollar and a half a day, or to four dollars and a half for each group of three.

Then ask one of the children to do the sum:

50 cts. worth a day $\times$ 365 days = \$182.50.

$\$182.50 \times 3 = \$547.50 \times 68,000,000 \text{ people} = \$37,230,000,000$ a year.

Thirty-seven thousand two hundred and thirty million dollars' worth of trade each year in order that each man, woman and child may get what half a dollar a day will buy! That is what it comes to.

In making these purchases and sales, weights, scales and measures are used. The man who tampers with his scale is a knave; the man who uses a light weight is a thief; the man who gives false measure is a criminal.

What word shall we use to designate the man who makes a bad dollar or the legislator who passes an act to force people to take it?

The only use for which money is required is to serve as an instrument of exchange in making all these purchases and sales. No one wants any money except to spend. Every one wants as much money as he can earn of the best kind, in order to buy a sufficient supply of food, fuel, clothing and shelter to meet each day's wants. The quality of the money is therefore the matter of utmost importance. The quantity of money even now in circulation would not suffice for a single month's transactions, hardly for a single week, if money were required in every purchase and sale. The work of trade is done mainly on credit because men trust each other as they have a right to. "The trust reposed in

and deserved by the many makes the opportunity for the fraud of the few." The credit which each man can extend to his neighbor depends not only upon the quality of the man, but also upon the quality of the money which is to be paid and which is to be received. When a doubt exists about the quality of the money trade stops. Credit cannot be given even to those who are entitled to it when the credit of the money itself is doubtful. That is what affects trade now. The quality of the money which is lawful in the United States is doubted. Why? Money that is doubted is bad money. It is not fit to be used.

The country is full of the elements of wealth and prosperity; the materials for food, fuel, shelter and clothing are in excessive abundance, but they must be kept moving. They are kept moving by the use of a small amount of good money and a great amount of credit. Credit depends upon the quality of the money. The quality of the money is doubted. Any one can measure the evil if he can once conceive of the check or stop to trade which comes to \$100,000,000 every day. Stop this traffic a week, and those who have small capital begin to fail. Stop it two weeks, and banks begin to fail. Stop it a month and a universal panic ensues. Stop it in part by doubtful credit, and trade is depressed everywhere. It is so now. Why?

This doubt of the quality of the money has been caused by the attempt to put a dollar made of silver into circulation under an act of legal tender, which dollar is not worth as much after it is melted as it purports to be worth in the coin. Bad money which is a legal tender drives good money out of circulation. Bad legal tender money is now driving good money made of gold out of circulation. Trade is checked. Men are beginning to fail. Banks are subject to ruin. Distrust prevails everywhere.

The only definition of good money is that it consists of coin which is worth as much after it is melted into bullion as it purports to be worth in the coin. Gold dollars are good money because they are worth as much in bullion as they are in coin. Silver dollars are bad money because they are not. They serve the purpose of good money only so long as the Government redeems them in gold or its equivalent. How long can the Government continue to do so? These are facts. Let any one contest them who can.

The present administration is making use of all the lawful

power that exists to put a stop to this distrust,—to maintain the credit of the country and to prevent a panic. It must be supported by banks, bankers and people alike, else the disaster will come. That disaster will be due to the temporary success of the advocates of the free coinage of silver dollars which are not worth as much after they are melted as they purport to be worth in the coin. There is hardly a man in this country who cannot to-day name important undertakings which have been and will be stopped until this cause of distrust is removed. This distrust stops trade: it stops enterprise: it promotes bankruptcy. The stupid or malignant enemies of the credit of the country must be held responsible. They are the advocates of the free coinage of silver dollars of full legal tender, which are now bad money.

These men are not bi-metallists. The bi-metallists scout them. They are either ignorant persons who do not know what bi-metallism is, or else they are special advocates of the so-called silver interests, who are ready to defraud the working-people of this country for their own personal profit. It is time to stop being tolerant on this question.

The proposal to coin silver dollars without limit and to force people to take them by an act of legal tender is an intolerable fraud. The purposes of its advocates can only be justified by commending their sincerity at the expense of their intelligence.

EDWARD ATKINSON.

THE ANTI-TRUST CAMPAIGN.

BY ALBION W. TOURGÉE.

HISTORY is the story of an endless conflict between the strong and the weak—the strong grasping always for more, the weak striving ever for enough. Sometimes the struggle is for dominion ; sometimes for possession. It matters not ; in the last analysis both mean the same—control. Sometimes the strong win by physical prowess, sometimes by intellectual acumen. At first, their weapon is the sword ; anon it is the law. Sometimes they compel through fear, sometimes through want. The weak battle sometimes for life, sometimes for liberty ; sometimes for parity of right, sometimes for equal opportunity. Sometimes they strive for security ; sometimes for sufficiency ; sometimes with the hope of superfluity. At first they ask only a chance to live ; anon they desire comfort and security ; after a time they demand parity of privilege and equal opportunity. To-day they appeal to law ; rest secure in its shelter ; observe its behests. To-morrow they begin to chafe under its restrictions, seek to break through its meshes, and either yield to its force and sink into dependency or break through and begin again the curious struggle. The loaf they beg to-day, they spurn as a stone to-morrow.

The strong are not always bad nor the weak always good. Indeed the average of the strong is often, perhaps always, better than the average of the weak, because their opportunity is greater. The strong are often unconscious of the wrongs they perpetrate. This is because the law, which is the creature of power, is silent as to evils which spring from its exercise ; while it denounces all that tends to disturb the harmony which power has established. Crime springs out of weakness, oppression out of strength. The law sanctions the act of the strong in taking bread out of the mouths of the weak ; but if the weak take but a loaf from the store of the strong, even to save himself from perishing, it punishes his act as a crime.

Dominion and wealth are mere complements of control. Do-

minion is control exercised through force or favor ; wealth is control exercised through inclination or necessity. Both are products of social life. Alone upon the earth a man would have neither power nor property ; for none can rule where there is none to obey, or possess aught unless another is forbidden to enjoy.

The laws of human impulse regulating the acquisition, establishment, and restriction of these two forms of control which one man may exercise over his fellows are substantially the same. Considered together they constitute the science of relation between the strong and the weak. This science rests on one immutable principle : Given more power than is needful to enable a man to repel the aggressions of his fellows, and he becomes himself an aggressor. Or, taking the other aspect of control : Given more wealth than is needful to defend him and his natural dependents against the rapacity of others, and a man begins at once to despoil his fellows. In both cases the act may be without any purpose to do harm or even with a sincere desire to do good. The ruler believes his right to rule divine, and counts it divinely ordained for the good of his subjects. He who has the control of values believes the right to do as he chooses with his own to be equally divine. All forms of government and all laws regulating possession are the result of this tendency. Because of this the anarchist would abolish government and destroy property, in the foolish hope thereby to avoid oppression and prevent want. He forgets that the principle he would exterminate is the very root of liberty and the only safeguard against poverty.

The impulse to acquire power is altogether healthful up to the limit of individual strength needful for self-defence. The greater the proportion among any people of those who have reached that point of self-reliance, the less is the danger of tyranny and oppression. So too, the impulse to possess, up to the limit of such acquisition as may be needful to provide against rapacity, is altogether healthful. The more there are who have enough, the fewer there will be who have too much. The power of the rich depends on the weakness of the poor, and the evils of poverty disappear precisely in proportion as strength and self-dependence increase. Undue power is always the result of special privilege ; undue accumulation, of special opportunity.

The only effective remedy for the evils of power in the hands of the few is the extension of privilege so as to enhance the power

of the many. The remedy for the evils of undue accumulation by the few is the enhancement of opportunity for the many. In other words, healthful progress demands both the stimulation of this impulse up to a certain point and its restriction after it reaches that point. One-half the problem has already been solved—and that the most difficult phase. What remains is only a corollary. The world has learned how to restrict power won by the sword and symbolized by the sceptre. Divine right to rule, as the prerogative of a few, is dead; but it is risen again as the immortal heritage of all; the crown upon the freeman's brow; the symbol of equal and universal right to rule our fellows as we submit to be ruled by them; the holy law of equal right and equal privilege for all.

In every age and every land the story of prerogative has been, in its essentials, the same. A thousand years ago one Strongarm slew a robber who was despoiling his fellows. Thereupon they praised him greatly and begged him to keep on killing robbers. He agreed, and they furnished him food and arms, a house and, by and by, retainers. Then he quit killing robbers and took to robbing, himself. After a while one Longhead undertook to relieve them of oppression. He overcame Strongarm and stepped into his shoes, took his castle and possessions, and, naturally, assumed his privileges. He flattered the people, despoiled their neighbors, scattered the plunder, brought back many slaves and made his people so drunk with luxury and the pretence of power that they contracted with him that he and his heirs should rule over them forever. It was such a very solemn affair that it was decreed that whoever should deny his right or that of his children should have his head cut off. So he established his favorites, nobles, and dependents throughout the land, and, when some murmured at his exactions, he cut their heads off as the law provided. That made people cautious about questioning his right.

After a time many of the weak grew to be strong and they proposed to one of his successors that he yield some items of his claim, but he refused—whereupon they tied his hands and took what they cared to have. One of his successors, however, with the aid of his nobles and their followings recouped what his ancestor had surrendered, and made laws still more stringent. Nevertheless, the people at length grew restive again; and when he did refuse to have his hands tied and to content himself with the shadow

of rulership, they cut off his head, and abolished the offices of his favorites and the privileges of his nobles. When they had thus broken up the "combine," they found it not so hard to govern themselves, because each one was afraid to take more than his share of power lest the others should subject him to the same treatment. Now and then one tried it, but found that when privilege was once expunged from the law of the land it was a very hard task to set it on its feet again among the people. The truth is, every one likes so well the honor of being even an aliquot part of a sovereign that, though he may use his power very ill or hardly be able to see that he has any, he has no notion of allowing another to take it away.

The Strongarms of the past ruled by brute force; but the Longheads added to force the control of opportunity and material resources. The process is well illustrated in the story of Joseph. He took, during the seven years of plenty, one-fifth of the produce of the land. This was the tribute which the people paid their Strongarm, Pharaoh, for protecting them from robbers; then, during the years of famine, Joseph, who was only a hired Longhead, sold the corn back to those who had raised it and took in exchange their lands. "For the Egyptians sold every man his field because the famine prevailed over them; so the land became Pharaoh's." "Skin for skin; all that a man hath will he give for his life." Pharaoh made an excellent trade; but how about the people? If government is "for the people," can it permit the impoverishment of the many for the enrichment and exaltation of the few? But the corn was his, and a man has a right to do what he chooses with his own, says the objector. Is the right of property a thing so divine that all other rights disappear before it? If he had a right to refuse to sell except at his own price, he had a right also to leave the people to starve. He might have kept the corn and had the land, too.

Let us give the story a modern application. Suppose a thousand capitalists, having certain knowledge that there will be a famine in our land some years hence, should procure a charter—that is the equivalent of Pharaoh's ring on Joseph's hand—to buy, store, and sell wheat. They buy, build granaries, hire guards, mount cannon. Then the famine comes. They refuse to sell except for land: "Your land or your life!" is their demand. They are invincible to any force that may be brought against

them. They have the power of government behind them, for it is bound by its contract, the charter ; and as "every man has a right to do what he chooses with his own," the company who have "cornered" the world's cereals have a right to fix their own price or not sell their wheat at all. Why should not such a "combine" play again the game which Joseph played for Pharaoh ? It has not been done, and is not likely to be attempted in its completeness, because of the uncertainty of modern meteorological predictions ; but in its elements it is attempted every time a "grain pool" "corners the market ;" only, instead of an actual scarcity, the price is inflated by an artificial one.

The protest against the power of unrestricted accumulation comes late in the world's history, for many reasons. First among them is the fact that not until very recent times has it been clearly recognized that the power of wealth is separable from the power of privilege, of which it was in the past most frequently an incident. Indeed, while privilege was dominant, mere untitled wealth was subordinate, and so very often cast its strength with the weak, who fought against prerogative. Every hereditary nobility was also a hereditary plutocracy, and dread of the power of wealth was merged in the more intense dread of privilege. It was thought, too, that mere parity of right to acquire would so stimulate competition as to prevent harmful accumulation ; but it was overlooked that a mere right to do is fruitless unless linked with opportunity. He who is born only to poverty and an appetite cannot compete in acquisition on even terms with one whose inheritance needs not his strength to make it grow. He may do it, and sometimes may even overcome the disadvantage, but for every one who is able to do so there will always be a thousand who will be overwhelmed by such disparity of opportunity.

Especially was it not realized that the almost universal application of intelligence to the work of material acquisition, the opening of unexpected vistas of controllable values, and the material progress which science and invention have made possible would enable the almost incredible accumulations of to-day to be applied with inconceivable rapidity and ease to the accomplishment of the most remote and unrelated purposes ; that the power of wealth would be multiplied by unheard-of legal devices and the opportunities for combination and coöperation in the appli-

cation of capital would be so enhanced that whole peoples may be subjected to the will of a "combine" of to-day as easily as a single purchaser or tenant to his creditor's demand a hundred years ago. The truth is only of late becoming clearly apparent that the danger resulting from prerogative is greatly enhanced by, if not strictly dependent upon, the facility with which many great holdings may be united under one control and applied to a single purpose. As combination was the strength of privilege, so it has now become the right hand of plutocratic power.

"The Western crusade against trusts," as the sentiment which for some years has been showing especial strength there is sometimes termed, is merely the most pronounced form of the protest against the most evidently dangerous feature of plutocratic control. It is not a crusade against "wealth" any more than democracy is a crusade against power. It is only a demand for the restriction of power exercised by combined accumulation, as democracy was a crusade against the power of combined privilege.

The term "trust," in its general acceptance, includes all combinations of capital intended to take advantage of the necessities of the many for the benefit of the few. "What do you mean by a 'trust'?" was asked of a wage-earner of exceptional intelligence, who had stoutly declared his antagonism thereto. "A 'trust,'" was his reply, "is a combination of capitalists to run things in their own way for their own profit, and without regard to the interests or needs of others."

The specific forms of combination are as various almost as their purposes. A, B, C, and D furnish each a certain sum of money to form a "blind pool" to "bull" or "bear" a specific stock or "corner" some staple. It is simply a voluntary agreement to use the values they control to create a fictitious scarcity or a false demand, whereby other persons are to be deprived of values they now hold or may acquire for the benefit of the men who constitute the "pool." It is just as much business, and of precisely the same character, as wrecking by the display of false lights. The "lambs" are "plucked," which means that the dead are plundered and the weak are stripped of the means of self-support. F and G, having control of the only means by which one of the prime necessities of life can be carried to those using it, agree with H that they will carry it for him at a certain rate, but will charge others two or three times as much. I, J, K, and

L, owning the greater part of the stock on hand and the majority of plants by which a certain article is manufactured, combine to share production and sale among them in specific proportions, agreeing not to compete with each other and to join with each other in underselling all other competitors. The purpose of each combination is to limit the supply, destroy competition, and so regulate price and monopolize profits. The mechanism by which it is effected is sometimes a secret agreement; sometimes a deed of trust giving certain parties control of their plants, stock, and good will, and sometimes a corporation which issues stock, fully paid up and non-assessable, in specific proportions for the various businesses it absorbs. Sometimes it is an assignment of all the specific interests to a managing body bound to divide the profits of manufacture and sale in a specific proportion between the combining parties. In all cases the effect, if the "combine" is strong enough, is to drive competing parties out of business and leave them to advance prices as they may see fit. The number of "trusts" substantially of this character is very great, and embraces an infinite variety of manufactured products.

By such means the power of the individual capitalist is many times increased, and not only the consumer, but the rival manufacturer, suffers by the suppression of competition. Such agreements are so manifestly iniquitous that no party to one has ever yet asked a court to enforce its conditions against another member.

It is often alleged that the effect of "trusts" is to lessen to the consumer the cost of the products they affect. The statement is so incongruous with the known and avowed purpose of the "trust" that only a people fond of "fine distinctions" would give it a respectful hearing. The number of Americans who desire to be thought "smarter" than others is, however, so great that such a paradox finds many to give it harbor and reiteration until they themselves, no doubt, come to believe it. The sole object of a "trust" is to prevent competition, and thereby enhance the profits of the parties interested in it. That these parties, having taken the pains and been at the expense of destroying their competitors, should voluntarily reduce their own profits, is a theory at war with the very principle upon which the "trust" is based—the principle of "get all you can and hold all you get."

Such a display of organized charity is not only paradoxical, but inconceivable.

But, aside from the question of the cost of an article of prime necessity to the consumer, the public has a very material interest in the distribution of the profits of production. The ultimate objective of government is the quality and character of those subject to it, and the purpose of all political economy should be to improve the general conditions in order that the quality of the citizenship may be enhanced. To attain this end the highest possible average of intelligence and self-dependence is necessary. This does not always result from the highest average wealth. One man worth \$10,000,000 and 1,000 men worth only one dollar each would give a remarkably high aggregate and average of wealth. Yet only one of them would have a shred of manhood or independence. A nation constituted in that proportion would be at once the richest and the poorest in the world. It would be a paradise of wealth and a hell of infamy and degradation. Only a very general distribution of wealth can give a high average quality of citizenship and self-dependence; and this is directly prevented when the profits of production are centred in few hands.

The more men there are who are self-employing and self-directing and the fewer there are who are dependent on the will of others for the employment that means life and comfort to them and their families the better. Ten thousand men worth a hundredth of a million dollars a piece are worth a thousand times as much to a nation and the world as one man worth a hundred millions. Every man who runs his own business offers opportunity for a higher grade of workers, and the stimulus of this opportunity is felt by the very lowest. A hundred such will give employment, perhaps, to an equal number of superintendents, overseers, book-keepers and junior partners—all winning their own way to independency. Unite these businesses, and instead of an aggregate of three or four hundred assistants we have perhaps a score hardly better paid and with much less prospect of independence before them. The others are driven to some other avenue of self-support, adding just so many families to the army of dependent laborers. Thus the over-enrichment of one means the impoverishment of many and adds to the competition impelled by necessity, which is the means by which the many are deprived of opportunity. "Skin for skin; all that a man hath will he give for his life," and

the greater the number of those who are shut up to wage-earning for a livelihood the greater the competition which drives the lower ranks into want and desperation. It is always the lower stratum that feels first and most keenly the force of harsh conditions, because upon it rests the weight of the entire superstructure. Whenever the number of the employers of labor is reduced, the number of the employed is increased; and when the numbers of the higher grades of employees is reduced the ranks of the lower grades are swollen to that extent. With this cumulative pressure the numbers of the unemployed are necessarily enhanced, and the weakest of the weak feel first the pangs of absolute dependence. It is from them that the cry for amendment always comes the first. Their methods of amendment may be wrong, usually are in fact, but their prescience of evil is unerring. They know where the shoe pinches, though they seldom know how to remedy the defect.

We often meet the claim that the evils of this sort should be tolerated because of the benefits derived from the benevolence of those who profit by them. The strong have always pleaded their good works in extenuation of the wrongs they did. The Roman emperors pointed to the games they established, the free baths they constructed and the temples they erected, as potent reasons why the people should uphold their power. Similar claims have been put forward by every class who have absorbed an undue share of power, both before and since that time. Let us not depreciate the benevolence of those who, in whatever manner, have come into control of vast accumulations, but it is well to remember that charity does not change the complexion of evil. The fact that Dick Turpin scattered money among the poor did not make his crime in robbing the rich less heinous; nor would Captain Kild have been counted a benefactor of mankind even if he had used his treasures to found colleges and theological seminaries, instead of hiding them "on strands forlorn as he sailed." The difference between the moral quality of robbery committed by false signals under a black flag and robbery committed by false reports or a fictitious scarcity on a black Friday is not easy to state, though it is easy to see that in motive they may be very far apart. The law takes cognizance of the one as a crime and not of the other. Because of this the man engaging in the one is duly advertised in advance of the true character

of his act ; while in the other case one might well say : " This cannot be very wrong, since the law does not forbid it."

Even an unintended wrong cannot have its moral expunged, however, by the mere dedication of a percentage of its results to a good use. There is, in fact, something too farcical about a man giving what he has wrongfully taken from another to benevolence as a palliation of the wrong to permit its serious consideration.

There is, however, an aspect of this plea for toleration because of resulting public benefits that ought not to be lightly passed over. There are four methods by which the public derives benefit from the individual control of values, or individual wealth : (1.) The owner is enabled thereby to support himself and family, and prevent them from becoming a charge upon the public. (2.) By the payment of taxes for the support of government. (3.) By voluntary benevolence in promotion of charity, education and religion. (4.) By the undertaking and achievement of enterprises requiring large initial investments.

The first of these is much greater in amount, and of vastly more importance, than any if not all the others. This, of course, is best subserved by many small accumulations than by a few great ones. It is far better that one hundred families should have independent self-support, on a capital of \$10,000 each, than that one family should enjoy the income of a capital of \$1,000,000. In like manner, the support of government by taxation is much more sure and certain in the case of small than of large holdings. The man of moderate means has little opportunity to avoid taxation, the man of very large means very generally finds some way to shirk a part of the burden which seems all the heavier because the aggregate is swelled by his accumulations. A million dollars having a hundred owners will, as a rule, bear a much larger part of the public burden represented by taxation than the same sum under the control of one owner. So far as private voluntary benevolences are concerned, the same rule prevails. If we add together the great fortunes of any land and set over against them an equal aggregate of moderate ones, we shall find that the same amount of wealth yields more voluntary benevolence when in the hands of the many than when held by a few. It is not the great fortunes of the country that have built and supported its churches, schools, and colleges, but men of moderate and often straitened means who have done

the major part. When a man gives \$50,000, \$100,000, or \$1,000,000 to such a purpose, it is always heralded to the world as a wonder. It takes a thousand subscriptions of \$1,000 each to balance it. But it always is balanced and much more. Counting the aggregate of social and religious benevolences which are supported by those of moderate means, it is not too much to say that every million dollars owned by many gives to private charity and benevolence many-fold greater tribute than the average \$1,000,000 controlled by a single individual.

There remains only the consideration of great enterprises requiring large investments for their initiation. In this respect it is perhaps true that the public advantage is subserved by immense accumulations. In the financial history of the last half-century or so, however, this is not altogether apparent. Nearly all the great enterprises of that time have been inaugurated and carried well towards success by the subscriptions of men of small means, while the great capitalist has gained control and added to his over-accumulation by "freezing out" the original investors and absorbing the values created by the enterprise of lesser men. The difficulty seems to be not to inaugurate great enterprises by the coöperation of small investors, but to protect the small investors against the rapacity of larger ones.

It is natural that the sentiment against this form of control should take a more definite form and find more general expression in the West than in the East. A much larger proportion of the population of the West than of the East are self-employers and naturally dislike the process of reduction to the ranks of the dependent employee which threatens them. Besides that, the West has drawn from the East, by a process of natural selection peculiar to our past, the most independent and vigorous of its elements—not necessarily the best, but the strongest. The young man who preferred hardship and independence to the conditions which faced him at the East went West. The man who failed in business in New England, whose pride would not permit him to serve where he had once directed, went West. The volunteer soldier who found the avenues of business closed against him on his return from the war, packed his kit and camped on the frontier. The immigrant who sought the West from abroad, also, as a rule, was of a more self-reliant character than those who stopped in the East: they sought homes, and were largely

agricultural in their character; those who tarried in the East were largely servants and employees who sought only a better service, not individual adventure and self-supporting homesteads. This process has been going on for half a century — perhaps to a large extent from the very date of settlement. Such a population is naturally more restive under conditions which they believe are both dangerous and remediable than one which has inherited the idea that, however harsh they may be, they are quite incurable; that the only way to avoid being crushed on the lower levels is to lie down and try to worm one's way to the upper ones. The demand for remedy and restriction is therefore louder, more emphatic, and more general in the West, for which reason some have identified the crusade against trusts with the West. The feeling of apprehension is perhaps quite as general in the East, but different conditions incline the Eastern man to greater caution and oft-repeated inquiry as to how any amendment may be secured; while the Westerner, perhaps, too readily responds: "Anyhow."

The relation of this sentiment to the Populist party is not easy to define. That only a small portion of it is represented by that party is evident to any careful observer. While antagonism to trusts is one of the tenets of that organization, it has so many others, and they are of so heterogeneous a nature, that they seem to have driven from its support many of the more conservative of those with whom this antagonism is deepest. The strength of the movement does not consist of men who are either socialists or revolutionists. They do not expect the world to be made over in a moment, nor believe in any untested cure-all for economic ills. They simply believe that a great and growing evil exists and must be remedied.

There is no occasion at this time to consider the remedies that might avail or the means by which they may be applied. There is no doubt that the same conviction which has made the principle of the Granger cases an integral part of our law and has forced all parties to admit the right of State and Nation to regulate corporate control of transportation will find a way to restrict the power of capitalistic "combines" of every sort and character, and relieve our civilization of the peril of a feudalism based on wealth.

ALBION W. TOURGÉE.

SILVER LEGISLATION AND ITS RESULTS.

BY THE HON. EDWARD O. LEECH, LATE DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

FROM the formation of the Government our coinage legislation has been out of touch with the rest of the world. The first Coinage Act (1792) authorized the unrestricted mintage of gold and silver, at the proportion of 1 of gold to 15 of silver—a ratio not in accordance with the commercial value of the two metals. Gold being undervalued in our coinage system gold coins did not circulate, but were exported in exchange for commodities at the commercial value of the pure gold in such coins. To remedy this, in 1834 (and supplemental Act of 1837), the quantity of gold in the dollar was reduced and the ratio in coinage was fixed at 1 to 15.988,—practically, 1 to 16. This change did not correspond to the commercial value of the two metals,—silver being undervalued,—and, as a consequence, silver was shipped abroad, so that from 1834 to 1873 gold constituted our only metallic currency.

In 1873 Congress abolished the silver dollar—a practically obsolete coin—and gold was made the sole standard of value. At that period this country had exclusively a paper circulation, the depreciation of which was measured by gold. The law of Feb. 12, 1873, was the logical sequence of the legislation of 1834–37, confirmed and strengthened by the legislation of 1853 (making fractional silver coins subsidiary), which laws practically made gold the standard of this country. In discontinuing the coinage of the silver dollar in 1873 Congress, therefore, simply recognized an existing fact by dropping a coin which had formed no appreciable portion of our circulating medium for nearly half a century. The entire coinage of silver dollars from 1792 to 1873 had aggregated only 8,031,238 pieces, none of which were in circulation. Had not the demonetization of the silver dollar taken place in 1873, it must necessarily have taken place a few years later, when the European countries, one after another, abolished silver coinage,

or else this country would have resumed specie payments in 1879 on a silver instead of a gold basis.

The silver legislation of this country commencing in 1878 has been a series of compromise measures with the advocates of free silver coinage. A brief review of the monetary situation at the commencement of silver legislation in 1878, and of what has been done in the way of silver accumulation since, will be instructive.

During the War of the Rebellion we had issued, as a war measure, legal tender notes amounting, at the highest point—June 30, 1864—to \$447,300,203. In January, 1875, Congress passed an act for the resumption of specie payments which required that :

“On and after the first day of January, 1879, the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem in coin the United States legal-tender notes then outstanding on their presentation for redemption.”

The amount of legal-tender notes outstanding at that time was \$382,000,000. Before the beneficial effects of specie resumption could be realized, however, Congress passed (May 31, 1878) an Act which provided that no more legal-tender notes should be retired, but when received into the Treasury *from any source*, should be paid out again and *kept in circulation*. The amount outstanding at this time was \$346,681,016—at which it has since remained. Notwithstanding that this baneful Act prevented the retirement of the notes of the government, issued during the period of civil war, as the Specie Resumption Act contemplated, which retirement would have been speedily replaced by bank-notes issued under the provisions of the National-Banking Act, nevertheless, at this period, the entire currency of our country consisted of gold coin, legal-tender notes amply secured, and bank-notes redeemable in lawful money.

STOCK OF MONEY JANUARY 1, 1878.

Gold.....	\$229,000,000
Legal-Tender Notes.....	346,681,016
National Bank Notes.....	321,672,505
Total.....	\$897,353,521

Our currency was entirely a gold currency,— a currency based on gold. No silver coins (except change-money), nor silver notes, embarrassed us. Our stock of gold was increasing rapidly and enormously. The gold coinage of our mints aggregated in the six fiscal years commencing in 1873 and ending in 1878 \$254,302,134. Ample facility was provided for the issue of addi-

tional currency by the provisions of the National-Banking Law, the only limitation to the amount of bank-notes which the banks could issue being the bonded debt of the United States necessary to secure circulation, at that time \$1,832,259,310.

Such was the monetary situation at home when we entered upon the era of silver legislation. Abroad the situation was not propitious for silver. Commencing with the demonetization of silver in Germany in 1873, and the melting down and sale by that Empire of 1,081,724,800 marks (\$257,454,000) in silver coins, followed by the suspension of silver coinage by the States of the Latin Union, one after another the European States had closed their mints to silver coinage, until in 1878,—when this country commenced the purchase and coinage of silver,—not a single mint in Europe was open for the coinage of silver for individuals.

In 1878 the House of Representatives passed a bill for the free coinage of silver dollars. This was amended in the Senate, concurred in by the House, and finally enacted into a law over a Presidential veto, by which the coinage of the silver dollar, with full debt-paying power, was restored,—not for individuals, as prior to 1873,—but on government account; the law requiring the mandatory purchase and coinage, monthly, of not less than two million nor more than four million dollars' worth of silver bullion, with a further provision authorizing the issue of paper certificates in sums of ten dollars and multiples, in lieu of the actual dollars. Although the minimum amount only was purchased and coined the purchases of silver under this Act aggregated 291,292,019 ounces, costing \$308,190,262, from which there was coined and issued, either in actual dollars or paper certificates, 378,166,795 silver dollars.

The government paid the cost of transporting these dollars from the Mint or Treasury offices to any point where wanted. But the great bulk of them returned to the Treasury. Various devices were tried to promote their circulation, notably by reducing, and finally discontinuing, the issue of legal-tender notes of denominations less than five dollars; by receiving deposits of gold coin and legal tender notes from individuals and banks at the Assistant Treasury in New York, and furnishing silver certificates at distant points, thus *saving* the cost of transportation; and, finally, by the Act of August 4, 1886, authorizing the issue of silver certificates in denominations of one, two and five dollars,

under the operations of which the large certificates rejected by the banks and general public were replaced by small ones, until over ninety per cent. of all the silver certificates outstanding were in denominations of ten dollars and less.

Owing to the unparalleled increase of population and business in the United States, and especially to the fact that these dollars, issued in the form of small certificates, largely supplied the demand for small currency and filled the vacuum created by the retirement of national bank notes, the exchange value of the silver dollar, possessing a commercial value very much less than the gold dollar, had preserved its equality in domestic circulation with the gold dollar, by law the unit of value. Since February 1, 1878, when we had no silver currency, to July 1, 1890, a period of twelve years, there had been injected into the circulation of this country by mandatory force of law some 354,000,000 of silver dollars and their paper representatives.

In the meantime, notwithstanding this enormous absorption of silver by our government for currency purposes, the market price of that metal had fallen from \$1.20½ an ounce on February 28, 1878, to \$0.92 an ounce on May 29, 1889, and the value of the silver in the dollar from \$0.93 to \$0.71 cents. But the advocates of silver money were not satisfied with so slow a change from a gold to a silver currency. On June 17, 1890, the Senate of the United States by a vote of 42 yeas to 25 nays, passed a bill for the unrestricted coinage of silver for individuals into legal dollars at the ratio of 16 to 1, and the issue of paper certificates against such dollars. There was imminent danger that the Senate Bill would pass the House of Representatives, where there was a small majority for free-silver coinage. As a compromise measure the Act of July 14, 1890, the present silver law (improperly called the "Sherman" Act), was passed, which required the purchase by the Treasury Department, monthly, of four and a half million ounces of silver (instead of two million dollars' worth as under the act of 1878), payment to be made at the market price, in new legal-tender notes.

The Act required the coinage into silver dollars, monthly, until July 1, 1891, of two million ounces of the silver so purchased, and after that date the coinage of silver dollars was left discretionary with the Secretary of the Treasury. The law further required that the silver bars purchased and the dollars coined

therefrom should be held in the Treasury as a reserve against the legal-tender notes issued. The one saving clause of this law is the declaration, inserted by Senator Sherman, that it is the "established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law."

Under the operations of this law the Treasury has purchased, from August 13, 1890, when the law went into effect, to June 1, 1893, 152,413,792 ounces of silver, at a cost of \$143,591,569—worth, at the present price of silver (\$0.83 per ounce), \$126,503,447—an actual loss of over \$17,000,000. Of this there has been coined into silver dollars, to June 1, 1893, \$30,087,040—making the total coinage of silver dollars (including 5,078,472, from trade-dollar bullion), from February 28, 1878, to June 1, 1893, \$419,332,305, leaving in the Treasury uncoined 123,911,185 ounces of fine silver, costing \$114,299,757, which could be bought to-day for \$102,846,284.

The stock of silver bars, stored in the vaults of the Treasury, represents the product of all the silver mines of this country for a period of more than two years. As an available asset of the Government it is of no practical value. This immense stock of uncoined silver is a standing menace to the market for silver. If Congress should direct that it be sold, the very fact that this huge pile of silver was for sale would break the market and cause a serious fall in the price of the white metal. If it should be coined under any authority of law to issue it as additional currency, it would still further unsettle confidence in the ability of our government to maintain the gold standard, and hasten our steps towards a silver basis for our currency. Notwithstanding the large purchases of silver by our Treasury under the Act of 1890 the price of that metal has fallen from 96 cents an ounce on April 1, 1890, to 82 cents an ounce on March 22, 1893, and the commercial value of the silver dollars from $74\frac{1}{2}$ cents to $63\frac{1}{2}$ cents. The total purchases of silver bullion since February 28, 1878, to June 1, 1893, have aggregated 443,705,811 ounces, equivalent to 15,212 tons, costing \$451,790,831.

Such, then, has been the history of silver legislation in this country for the past fifteen years. At a time when the mints of all Europe were closed to the coinage of silver money, when the most strenuous efforts were being made by those countries to

place themselves on the gold standard and to obtain the gold needed for that purpose, this country, acting in monetary isolation, with absolutely no silver currency in 1878, has gone on and on forcing silver currency into the channels of trade and piling up silver bars in its Treasury. If we had not entered upon this silver-purchase scheme the bulk of the silver purchased by our treasury would have been shipped abroad and paid for in gold, or gold exchange, and added in some form of currency just that amount of gold circulation to the country.

The people of Europe have looked on in amazement to see when this remarkable policy would end—a policy which in a very much shorter time would have seriously embarrassed any other country in the world. The note of alarm has been sounded over and over again. The principle of the “Gresham” law that

IMPORTS OF GOLD COIN AND GOLD BULLION, CALENDAR YEARS 1888-1893.

Calendar Years.	Port of New York.	Port of San Francisco.	All other Ports.	Total.
1888.....	\$6,005,756	\$3,950,351	\$1,004,666	\$10,960,773
1889.....	6,304,267	4,617,871	1,082,491	12,004,632
1890.....	13,212,739	5,806,220	1,211,131	20,230,090
1891.....	31,963,398	10,011,453	2,990,239	44,970,110
1892.....	8,504,513	6,045,917	2,900,516	17,450,946
1893.				
January.....	86,893	36,585	247,365	370,843
February.....	879,605	9,423	363,511	1,257,539
March.....	4,191,134	22,606	2,391,637	6,603,437
April.....	644,071	13,384	146,530	803,985
May.....	25,680			25,680
Total.....	\$71,826,056	\$30,513,870	\$12,343,109	\$114,683,035

There was a *net* loss to the United States by gold exports of \$213,564,849. It will be noticed, however, that the return gold from Europe (all of which comes in at the port of New York) aggregated only \$71,826,056, so that the actual loss by reason of export to Europe was \$256,421,828. At the present time (June 1) the shipments of gold to Europe continue in increased amounts.

The stock of free gold in the Treasury, that is all the gold not held by law for the redemption of gold certificates, has fallen in the same period from \$218,818,253 (March 31, 1888) to \$95,048,640 (June 1, 1893).

In addition to \$380,169,081 silver dollars and silver certificates in circulation on June 1, 1893, sustained at par by our gold standard, there were outstanding at the same date \$335,977,323 in U. S. notes, and \$132,505,183 in redeemable-on-demand-in-gold Treasury notes with an available gold reserve of \$95,000,000. Moreover, the old stock argument in favor of silver purchases, that it increased the currency, is being disproved. The amount of money of all kinds in circulation June 1, 1892, was \$1,613,572,244, while on June 1, 1893, it was reduced to \$1,596,151,901, a reduction of over \$17,420,000 in the last year.

When we examine the kind of money in circulation the substitution of silver for gold currency becomes more apparent. Gold coin and gold certificates in circulation decreased in the last year \$56,790,953, while silver dollars, silver certificates and Treasury notes based on silver increased in the same period \$41,218,502, showing how rapidly and surely our currency is changing from gold to silver. The gold receipts of the government, which, in July, 1890, the date of the passage of the present silver

law, amounted to over 95 per cent. of the total receipts from customs, have fallen to less than one per cent.—practically to nothing.

The change from a gold to a silver currency in this country, which was very generally predicted in Europe, has been carefully watched by European investors. They have not failed to note the fact that, while our gold reserves were rapidly and seriously diminishing, our gold obligations, through the issue of Treasury notes in the mandatory purchases of silver bullion to the extent of about \$4,000,000 monthly, redeemable on demand in gold, were as rapidly increasing. The result has been to produce a thorough distrust in our ability to maintain gold payments. This impression has become so general abroad that an enormous amount of American securities, the most profitable form of investment for the European, have been sent back here for sale during the past two years, causing the balance of account to be almost continuously against us, notwithstanding the large exports of breadstuffs and other material from the United States in the fall and winter of 1891.

This is shown conclusively by the fact that, although the balance of merchandise trade was in favor of the United States for the two fiscal years—1891 and 1892—over 242,000,000, the *net* gold shipments for the same years was over \$63,000,000. That is to say, instead of paying us for our cereals in money, Europe paid us back our own debts and made us redeem \$68,000,000 of our debts besides.

At home the same apprehension has become almost universal among bankers and business men in the Eastern and Middle States, creating a feeling of distrust, resulting in a contraction of credits, or, at least, a more careful placing of credits and discouraging new business enterprises.

The remedy naturally suggests itself—the absolute repeal of the present silver law. Unfortunately, this is difficult to secure and can at best only be done when Congress meets. Another measure has been suggested which, as a temporary expedient, would undoubtedly have produced beneficial results if promptly acted upon, viz., the strengthening of the gold reserve by the sale of bonds.

That the legal right exists to sell bonds under the provisions of the act of January 14, 1875 (when gold alone was our standard and silver demonetized), to secure the gold necessary to

maintain specie payments, is so generally admitted by recognized authorities on financial matters that it is hardly worthy of discussion here.

If the provision in the Act of July 14, 1890, declaring it to be "the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity," has any signification, it contemplates the exercise of the means, provided by existing law, to carry it into effect. That declaration was intended as an assurance to all people that our currency would be maintained on a gold basis, and that if at any time there was danger that the two dollars would be of unequal value, it would be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to prevent it with the lawful means at his disposal.

That serious danger has existed for some time, that the two metals would have unequal values in our currency system, must be apparent to every one. The only method available to prevent such a catastrophe under existing law was to use the credit of the government to secure the necessary gold to insure the maintenance of the parity. That the placing of bonds to any reasonable amount—say fifty to one hundred million dollars—for gold coin, either at home or abroad, was perfectly practicable, no one doubts. That it would have restored confidence not only by securing the means to readily maintain gold payments, but as a substantial declaration to the world that the matchless credit of this great government would be used for that purpose whenever necessary, seems reasonable and highly probable. Moreover, it would have served as notice by the executive branch of the government to the legislative that the danger-line of silver currency had been reached and demanded prompt and decisive action by our law-makers, unless the people of this country were to be taxed to support silver purchases.

Since August 31, 1865, the bonded debt of the United States has been reduced from \$2,381,530,294 to \$585,034,810, a reduction of \$1,796,495,484, and during the last eight years, under the administrations of Presidents Cleveland and Harrison, the principal of the debt was reduced by the enormous sum of \$597,168,500 (not mentioning premiums and interest), an average of over \$74,500,000 annually. The result of this unusually large reduction of the debt in recent years has been to cripple the Treasury, not leaving a sufficient working balance for convenient business purposes, and the strengthening of this balance by the

proceeds of a bond sale would not only have restored confidence in the intent and ability of the Government to maintain all our money on a parity, but would have enormously assisted the Treasury in utilizing its available funds to the best advantage.

The root of the evil, however, lies in the present silver law, and unless this is removed it seems inevitable that our currency must reach a silver basis. What does a silver basis mean? It means, in the first instance, a violent and enormous contraction of our currency by the withdrawal of gold coins and gold certificates from circulation. After the first shock, when values have adjusted themselves to existing conditions, it means that the paying power of our money in foreign exchanges will be depreciated to the commercial value of our silver dollar, whatever that may be. We have an excellent illustration in our near neighbor—Mexico—of a country which is on a settled silver basis. The Mexican silver dollar, although it contains more silver than our dollar, has a purchasing power in foreign exchanges equal only to its value as silver bullion.

The relations between European countries and our own are as intimate to-day as the relations between the States of the Union prior to the Civil War. All Europe to-day has the gold standard, and all international exchanges are settled on a gold basis. Probably three-fourths of the foreign commerce of the United States is with European countries. Between countries which use the same metal as money there is a par of exchange which varies only within well-defined limits regulated by the balance of trade. Between countries which use different metals as a measure of values there is at present no natural par, because of the fluctuations in the commercial value of silver. Stability in the rates of exchange is the very essence of commercial transactions, especially commercial transactions based on credit. Without this there is necessarily an uncertainty, which it is impossible to eliminate and which complicates and deters business transactions. In this lies the permanent evil of a silver basis for our currency: *the uncertainty in the value of our money as measured by the money of commerce—gold.*

What the purchasing power of our currency in domestic transactions would be depends upon conditions which it is not possible to accurately forecast.

EDWARD O. LEECH.

SHOULD THE CHINESE BE EXCLUDED?

BY COL. R. G. INGERSOLL AND REPRESENTATIVE GEARY OF
CALIFORNIA.

COLONEL INGERSOLL:

THE average American, like the average man of any country, has but little imagination. People who speak a different language, or worship some other god, or wear clothing unlike his own, are beyond the horizon of his sympathy. He cares but little or nothing for the sufferings or misfortunes of those who are of a different complexion or of another race. His imagination is not powerful enough to recognize the human being, in spite of peculiarities. Instead of this he looks upon every difference as an evidence of inferiority, and for the inferior he has but little if any feeling. If these "inferior people" claim equal rights he feels insulted, and for the purpose of establishing his own superiority tramples on the rights of the so-called inferior.

In our own country the native has always considered himself as much better than the immigrant, and as far superior to all people of a different complexion. At one time our people hated the Irish, then the Germans, then the Italians, and now the Chinese. The Irish and Germans, however, became numerous. They became citizens, and, most important of all, they had votes. They combined, became powerful, and the political parties sought their aid. They had something to give in exchange for protection—in exchange for political rights. In consequence of this they were flattered by candidates, praised by the political press, and became powerful enough not only to protect themselves but at last to govern the principal cities in the United States. As a matter of fact the Irish and Germans drove the native Americans out of the trades and from the lower forms of labor. They built the railways and canals. They became servants. Afterwards the Irish and the Germans were driven from the canals and railways by the Italians.

The Irish and Germans improved their condition. They went into other businesses, into the higher and more lucrative trades. They entered the professions, turned their attention to politics, became merchants, brokers, and professors in colleges. They are not now building railroads or digging on public works. They are contractors, legislators, holders of office, and the Italians and Chinese are doing the old work.

If matters had been allowed to work in the natural way, without the interference of mobs or legislators, the Chinese would have driven the Italians to better employments, and all menial labor would, in time, be done by the Mongolians.

In olden times each nation hated all others. This was considered natural and patriotic. Spain, after many centuries of war expelled the Moors, then the Moriscoes, and then the Jews. And Spain, in the name of religion and patriotism, succeeded in driving from its territory its industry, its taste and its intelligence, and by these mistakes became poor, ignorant and weak. France started on the same path when the Huguenots were expelled, and even England at one time deported the Jews. In those days a difference of race or religion was sufficient to justify any absurdity and any cruelty.

In our country, as a matter of fact, there is but little prejudice against emigrants coming from Europe, except among naturalized citizens; but nearly all foreign-born citizens are united in their prejudice against the Chinese. The truth is that the Chinese came to this country by invitation. Under the Burlingame Treaty China and the United States recognized :

"The inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively from one country to the other for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents."

And it was provided

"That the citizens of the United States visiting or residing in China and Chinese subjects visiting or residing in the United States should reciprocally enjoy the same privileges, immunities and exemptions, in respect to travel or residence, as shall be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation, in the country in which they shall respectively be visiting or residing."

So, by the treaty of 1880, providing for the limitation or suspension of emigration of Chinese labor, it was declared :

"That the limitation or suspension should apply only to Chinese who emigrated to the United States as laborers ; but that Chinese laborers who were then in the United States should be allowed to go and come of their own free will and should be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities and exemptions, which were accorded to the citizens and subjects of the most favored nations."

It will thus be seen that all Chinese laborers who came to this country prior to the treaty of 1880 were to be treated the same as the citizens and subjects of the most favored nation ; that is to say, they were to be protected by our laws the same as we protect our own citizens.

These Chinese laborers are inoffensive, peaceable and law-abiding. They are honest, keeping their contracts, doing as they agree. They are exceedingly industrious, always ready to work and always giving satisfaction to their employers. They do not interfere with other people. They cannot become citizens. They have no voice in the making or in the execution of the laws. They attend to their own business. They have their own ideas, customs, religion and ceremonies—about as foolish as our own ; but they do not try to make converts nor to force their dogmas on others. They are patient, uncomplaining, stoical and philosophical. They earn what they can, giving reasonable value for the money they receive, and as a rule, when they have amassed a few thousand dollars, they go back to their own country. They do not interfere with our ideas, our ways or customs. They are silent workers, toiling without any object, except to do their work and get their pay. They do not establish saloons and run for Congress. Neither do they combine for the purpose of governing others. Of all the people on our soil they are the least meddlesome. Some of them smoke opium, but the opium-smoker does not beat his wife. Some of them play games of chance, but they are not members of the Stock Exchange. They eat the bread that they earn ; they neither beg nor steal, but they are of no use to parties or politicians except as they become fuel to supply the flame of prejudice. They are not citizens and they cannot vote. Their employers are about the only friends they have.

In the Pacific States the lowest became their enemies and asked for their expulsion. They denounced the Chinese and those who gave them work. The patient followers of Confucius were treated as outcasts—stoned by boys in the streets and

mobbed by the fathers. Few seemed to have any respect for their rights or their feelings. They were unlike us. They wore different clothes. They dressed their hair in a peculiar way, and therefore they were beyond our sympathies. These ideas, these practices, demoralized many communities; the laboring people became cruel and the small politicians infamous.

When the rights of even one human being are held in contempt the rights of all are in danger. We cannot destroy the liberties of others without losing our own. By exciting the prejudices of the ignorant we at last produce a contempt for law and justice, and sow the seeds of violence and crime.

Both of the great political parties pandered to the leaders of the crusade against the Chinese for the sake of electoral votes, and in the Pacific States the friends of the Chinese were forced to keep still or to publicly speak contrary to their convictions. The orators of the "Sand Lots" were in power, and the policy of the whole country was dictated by the most ignorant and prejudiced of our citizens. Both of the great parties ratified the outrages committed by the mobs, and proceeded with alacrity to violate the treaties and solemn obligations of the government. These treaties were violated, these obligations were denied, and thousands of Chinamen were deprived of their rights, of their property, and hundreds were maimed or murdered. They were driven from their homes. They were hunted like wild beasts. All this was done in a country that sends missionaries to China to tell the benighted savages of the blessed religion of the United States.

At first a demand was made that the Chinese should be driven out, then that no others should be allowed to come, and laws with these objects in view were passed, in spite of the treaties, preventing the coming of any more. For a time that satisfied the haters of the Mongolian. Then came a demand for more stringent legislation, so that many of the Chinese already here could be compelled to leave. The answer or response to this demand is what is known as the Geary Law.

By this act it is provided, among other things, that any Chinaman convicted of not being lawfully in the country shall be removed to China, after having been imprisoned at hard labor for not exceeding one year. This law also does away with bail on habeas corpus proceedings where the right to land has been denied to a Chinaman. It also compels all Chinese laborers to obtain,

within one year after the passage of the law, certificates of residence from the revenue collectors, and if found without such certificate they shall be held to be unlawfully in the United States.

It is further provided that if a Chinaman claims that he failed to get such certificate by "accident, sickness or other unavoidable cause," then he must clearly establish such claim to the satisfaction of the judge "by at least one credible white witness."

If we were at war with China then we might legally consider every Chinaman as an enemy, but we were and are at peace with that country. The Geary Act was passed by Congress and signed by the President simply for the sake of votes. The Democrats in Congress voted for it to save the Pacific States to the Democratic column; and a Republican President signed it so that the Pacific States should vote the Republican ticket. Principle was forgotten, or rather it was sacrificed in the hope of political success. It was then known, as now, that China is a peaceful nation, that it does not believe in war as a remedy, that it relies on negotiation and treaty. It is also known that the Chinese in this country were helpless, without friends, without power to defend themselves. It is possible that many members of Congress voted in favor of the Act believing that the Supreme Court would hold it unconstitutional, and that in the meantime it might be politically useful.

The idea of imprisoning a man at hard labor for a year, and this man a citizen of a friendly nation, for the crime of being found in this country without a certificate of residence must be abhorrent to the mind of every enlightened man. Such punishment for such an "offence" is barbarous and belongs to the earliest times of which we know. This law makes industry a crime and puts one who works for his bread on a level with thieves and the lowest criminals, treats him as a felon, and clothes him in the stripes of a convict,—and all this is done at the demand of the ignorant, of the prejudiced, of the heartless, and because the Chinese are not voters and have no political power.

The Chinese are not driven away because there is no room for them. Our country is not crowded. There are many millions of acres waiting for the plow. There is plenty of room here under our flag for five hundred millions of people. These Chinese that we wish to oppress and imprison are people who understand the art of irrigation. They can redeem the deserts. They are

the best of gardeners. They are modest and willing to occupy the lowest seats. They only ask to be day laborers, washers and ironers. They are willing to sweep and scrub. They are good cooks. They can clear lands and build railroads. They do not ask to be masters—they wish only to serve. In every capacity they are faithful; but in this country their virtues have made enemies, and they are hated because of their patience, their honesty and their industry.

The Geary Law, however, failed to provide the ways and means for carrying it into effect, so that the probability is it will remain a dead letter upon the statute book. The sum of money required to carry it out is too large, and the law fails to create the machinery and name the persons authorized to deport the Chinese. Neither is there any mode of trial pointed out. According to the law there need be no indictment by a Grand Jury, no trial by a jury, and the person found guilty of being here without a certificate of residence can be imprisoned and treated as a felon without the ordinary forms of trial.

This law is contrary to the laws and customs of nations. The punishment is unusual, severe, and contrary to our Constitution, and under its provisions aliens—citizens of a friendly nation—can be imprisoned without due process of law. The law is barbarous, contrary to the spirit and genius of American institutions, and was passed in violation of solemn treaty stipulations.

The Congress that passed it is the same that closed the gates of the World's Fair on the "blessed Sabbath," thinking it wicked to look at statues and pictures on that day. These representatives of the people seem to have had more piety than principle.

After the passage of such a law by the United States is it not indecent for us to send missionaries to China? Is there not work enough for them at home? We send ministers to China to convert the heathen; but when we find a Chinaman on our soil, where he can be saved by our example, we treat him as a criminal.

It is to the interest of this country to maintain friendly relations with China. We want the trade of nearly one-fourth of the human race. We want to pay for all we get from that country in articles of our own manufacture. We lost the trade of Mexico and the South American Republics because of slavery, because we hated people in whose veins was found a drop of African

blood, and now we are losing the trade of China by pandering to the prejudices of the ignorant and cruel.

After all, it pays to do right. This is a hard truth to learn—especially for a nation. A great nation should be bound by the highest conception of justice and honor. Above all things it should be true to its treaties, its contracts, its obligations. It should remember that its responsibilities are in accordance with its power and intelligence.

Our government is founded on the equality of human rights—on the idea, the sacred truth, that all are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Our country is an asylum for the oppressed of all nations—of all races. Here, the government gets its power from the consent of the governed. After the abolition of slavery these great truths were not only admitted, but they found expression in our Constitution and laws.

Shall we now go back to barbarism?

Russia is earning the hatred of the civilized world by driving the Jews from their homes. But what can the United States say? Our mouths are closed by the Geary Law. We are in the same business. Our law is as inhuman as the order or ukase of the Czar.

Let us retrace our steps, repeal the law and accomplish what we justly desire by civilized means. Let us treat China as we would England; and, above all, let us respect the rights of men.

R. G. INGERSOLL.

HON. THOMAS J. GEARY:

MUCH of the adverse criticism on the Chinese Restriction law of May, 1892, is due to ignorance of the situation which then confronted Congress, and the intent and purposes of the law. Those hostile to the Act of May 5, 1892, condemn, not the intention of the law, but the consequences following upon its violation, and which are the creation of the persons affected by it.

The consequences that now confront the Chinese in the United States are not the result contemplated by the Act, but are the results of the action of the Chinese themselves in defying the government, in their voluntary failure to obey its just and reasonable laws; and their possible deportation is the result of

their own actions, and not what was contemplated or expected when the law was passed. The law was intended only to prevent the further immigration of Chinese into the United States, and deportation of those legally here was not its purpose.

The Chinese law of May 5 was justified by the circumstances prevailing in this country; it was in accordance with the treaties made between this Government and China; it imposed no undue or unjust hardship upon the Chinese people here, and was a proper and just exercise of power on the part of this country. The condition that then confronted us is well stated by Mr. Joseph H. Choate, the attorney for the Chinese, in his argument before the United States Supreme Court in their behalf. He says:

"But in spite of the ever-increasing vigor of the successive restriction and exclusion acts, evading their prohibitions and the vigilance of the public authorities in their enforcement, another very large class of Chinese laborers had made their way into our territory. These were lawless intruders, not only having no right to be here, but having come in clandestinely, contrary to and in defiance of the express prohibitions of our statutes, and in appearance they were not easily distinguishable from the other class who under the treaties are entitled to be and remain here, whose rights, however, secured to them by the treaties had been uniformly observed and protected by the courts and the Government."

Again, of those unlawfully here, he says:

"As to the rights or status of that class of Chinese persons, or the legality or propriety of their removal by the method so provided, no question for consideration is here involved."

The law did not contemplate the deportation of those legally here—

"First, because the obvious purport and intent expressed in the Sixth Section is directly the contrary. It recognizes expressly their right to remain here, and, instead of revoking or attempting to take it away, it purports to construct a scheme, the constitutionality of which is presently to be considered, by which, as to each one of such persons in the United States, it is to be conclusively determined whether he does or does not belong to that class; and if he is so found and adjudged to belong to that class it leaves him undisturbed in the enjoyment of his right to remain in the United States, and if, on the other hand, he is found and adjudged not to belong to that class then his removal is provided for. Congress must have assumed, in constructing such scheme, that every Chinese laborer belonging or claiming to belong to that class would within the year present himself to the Collector of the Internal Revenue to have his right judicially determined by him; that in each instance it would be justly determined by the Collector, so that all would receive the protection intended by the Act in the form of the Collector's certificate of residence. Obviously, in this view,

it was the intent of the Act to protect and preserve the right to remain here to those to whom it belonged, to separate and distinguish them from the other class to whom the right to remain did not belong, and to give them an official certificate of their right."

Since 1882 the laws of this country have prohibited the coming into it of Chinese laborers. This law was known in China and was familiar to all of their people here, and yet year after year the law was violated and large numbers of Chinese, as Mr. Choate says, came into the country in violation of our laws. Their coming was encouraged by the Chinese here and over our borders, and through frauds practised at our seaports these people came into the land contrary to our wishes—they were not invited. Once here they were received with open arms by their people, and their identity was covered up and lost in the great mass of Chinese in the country who at all times lent all the assistance in their power to enable these people to violate the law. It was impossible to separate them from their fellow countrymen and return them to their native land, from the difficulty of distinguishing one from another, and as, with the disregard for truth which is admitted by all who know the race to be one of their characteristics, numbers of their fellows were always ready to come forward and testify that the accused had been in the United States for many years. These violations of law were encouraged by the Chinese legally here, and especially by the Six Companies, who made a profit out of the importation of the coolies. Either the restriction laws had to be repealed and the ports of the country thrown open to this class of immigration, or else some other measure that would secure the enforcement of the restriction laws had to be adopted.

It is claimed that the Act of 1892 was unnecessary, because more Chinese were leaving the country than entered it, and the number entering and leaving the port of San Francisco is cited to show that 48,000 more Chinese left the United States than entered it during the past decade. But the census shows the falseness of this argument. In 1880 there were 105,000 Chinese in the United States; in 1890 there were 106,000, or instead of decreasing 48,000 the number had actually increased. The only conclusion deducible is that 49,000 entered in defiance of our laws. Of all the Chinese now here, more than one-third are not here by our invitation but contrary to our expressed wish.

During these years the government has been compelled every year to expend large sums of money for the maintenance of guards and inspectors upon our frontiers and at our different sea-ports, in order to prevent the infraction of our laws by a race of people who never have shown any respect for them.

The Act of May, 1892, as Mr. Choate says, had for its primary and only object the identity of those Chinese who were justly here, so that we might distinguish them from those who came in violation of law, and who had no right to remain in the country. Its object was to prevent the deportation of the innocent or the infliction upon these of any hardships attendant upon its enforcement, and to distinguish them from the violators of the law.

The law was not harsh in its provisions, as we were more anxious to establish a means of identifying those who came hereafter than we were of visiting punishment upon those now in the country. This purpose was justified both by the necessity of securing obedience to our laws, and also upon the score of economy in reducing expenses which this government was compelled to incur every year, because of the attempts of this particular race to defy its laws.

Objection is made to the Sixth Section, providing for registration, on the ground that it subjects the Chinese to hardships and degrades them. If registration is a degradation, then there are many Americans who have a just right to complain. Thirty-four States require that citizens shall register before being allowed to vote, and some of these States demand that a description of the person shall be filed. Failure to comply with these laws is punished by loss of suffrage. Wherein lies the hardship for the alien in requiring him to do that which nearly all States demand of the American citizen?

In most of the States the members of certain professions and trades are required to register and receive a certificate before being allowed to pursue their calling, and for violation of these laws are punishable by imprisonment and fine. These laws are interferences with the natural rights of citizens and discriminate between callings; but complaint is not made by American citizens that by complying with them they are subjected to any disgrace. These laws are necessary to prevent frauds in the exercise of the suffrage, and to identify the citizens entitled to participate

in elections, and to prevent frauds being practised upon the people to their injury.

Surely, if it is right in order to secure the safety of our people from quacks and other fraudulent pretenders, it is right to use the same means to protect us from an immigration that we do not want and whose continuance is injurious. In the case of the Chinese, year after year we have found frauds practised upon the government, and the government subjected to expenses to protect itself against these frauds, and we apply to them the same rule that for years we have been applying to our own citizens—a rule justified by the actions of these people, and made necessary by their own criminal behavior.

If we had imposed a tax upon Chinamen, if we had made compliance with the law difficult or onerous, some modification of the law might be justifiable; but, recognizing how difficult and inconvenient to them it might be to attend before officers far removed from their residences, the law provided that the officers should go to the Chinaman wherever he was, and afford him every facility for complying with the law without expense or burden to him. Under these circumstances, and because of the belief that the law was justified by the conditions that confronted us, by the desire to maintain and insure respect for the laws of this country among the people of alien races, the law was wise and right, and ought to be enforced.

This law is beneficial, rather than degrading, to the Chinaman legally here. Under the old law he was subject to arrest at any time, on the charge of having come illegally into the country. He was at the mercy of any of his fellows who sought to inflict on him this form of annoyance; and charged with being illegally here he was subject to arrest and forced to incur the expenses attendant upon a trial to determine his right to remain, while the proof was necessarily parole, and perjury might be resorted to with ease and with comparative freedom from penal consequences. This law gives him, under the seal of government, a justification for his presence, and the written testimony always with him to free himself from this inconvenience and annoyance, while his right to remain could only be questioned and the production of his certificate required by a regularly appointed federal officer, who we cannot presume would use his position to violate the spirit of the law or to harass and annoy.

The opponents of the law say that the Chinaman was required to carry about him a certificate, having stamped thereon his own photograph ; and we are told that the man must feel dishonored, because he carries his own picture in his vest pocket. Such an argument is unworthy of notice. From the resemblance which all Chinamen bear to one another no other means of identifying them than by photograph could be selected. We tried the description by other means under the law of 1882, and found it radically defective.

If previous laws had been complied with this law would not be necessary. It is known from experience in California, where nine-tenths of all the Chinese in the United States reside, that the great mass of Chinamen here would gladly and willingly have complied with the law but for the threats of their masters, the Six Companies, who hold the great mass of Chinese in the United States under their control and authority.

Thirty years ago we spent millions of dollars and sacrificed thousands of American lives to free this land from the curse of African slavery. To-day we have the exhibition of another race as absolutely enslaved by their masters as were the negroes in the South, establishing themselves and their institutions in our midst ; and if it were well to free the country at that time from the slavery of the black, it ought to be equally essential and patriotic at this time to protect our country from the evils of Asiatic slavery, and our American labor from the unjust and degrading competition presented to them by the Chinese. Slave labor is not one of the essentials for the proper development of American civilization.

There would have been no failure to comply with this law on the part of the Chinese but for the Six Companies, whose antagonism to it is not because of the degradation which it offers to their subjects, but for the reason that the enforcement of the law would insure a certain means of preventing in the future any further importation of their slaves. It was the destruction of their slave industry that caused the Six Companies to make the effort they have made to secure the defeat of the law, and not any love for the vassals now in their employment here.

This law is justified by the treaties between America and China, and is in entire accord with the last compact between this government and the government of that country. In this treaty it is provided :

"If Chinese laborers, or Chinese of any other class, now either permanently or temporarily residing in the United States, meet with ill-treatment at the hands of any other persons, the Government of the United States will exert all its power to devise measures for their protection, and to secure to them the same rights, privileges, immunities and exemption as may be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation, and to which they are entitled by treaty."

This language is not found in any other treaty with any other government, and illustrates the superiority of Chinese diplomacy in negotiating treaties.

Recognizing the complex character of our government, the inability on the part of the National Government to control the States, and the primary liability of the States for injuries inflicted upon people, whether citizens or aliens, when committed in defiance of law, the Chinese Government not desiring to be compelled to seek redress from States and municipalities for injuries inflicted on Chinamen, secured from the National Government a declaration insuring the protection of their people, which undoubtedly makes the National Government primarily liable for such injuries. And such was undoubtedly the intention of China and the construction to be placed on that section of the treaty. This being the case, the liability of the National Government for injuries inflicted upon Chinese having been assumed by it in the treaty, that liability could only apply in the case of injuries inflicted upon Chinamen in the country in compliance with our laws, and the National Government could not be liable for those who came in violation thereof. Under these circumstances it was the duty of this government to adopt a system of registration of all these people for whose protection they became specially liable, so that it would know the measure of its liability, and protect itself against fraudulent claims imposed upon it by those who came in defiance of law. The exercise of the registration power was proper, and is justified by this treaty, and failure to require registration would be gross carelessness.

Some people will condemn all restriction laws, because from the fatherhood-of-God and the brotherhood-of-man standpoint, all men being equal, all men should be permitted the same degree of freedom and liberty in the practice of their trades and callings, and in the enjoyment of whatever fruits may come to them from their own industry, and all laws that interfere with the in-

dividual man, restricting his opportunities, or denying him the right to enjoy life and liberty, must be condemned by humanitarians and Christians. But this beautiful sentiment finds no application in the exercise of governmental powers, because the first duty of governments is to their own citizens, and in securing to them protection and the enjoyment of their life and liberty the consideration of the effect on other people is not of consequence.

The Chinese differ from all other people with whom we have been brought into competition. The population of China amounts to over four hundred million people, and nearly all of them are laborers. Mr. Bedloe, Consul at Amoy, in his report for January, 1892, gives an interesting table of the earnings, cost of living, and mode of life of the Chinese people. In that report he puts the average earnings of the Chinese adult, employed as mechanic or laborer, at five dollars per month, and states that this is ten per cent. above the average wages prevailing throughout China, while the cost of living of an adult is estimated by him at six cents per day.

Here is a condition deserving of attention by all friends of this country, and by all who believe in the protection of our working classes. Is it fair to subject our laborer to the competition of a rival who can measure his wants by an expenditure of six cents a day, and who can live on an income not exceeding five dollars a month? What will become of the boasted civilization of our country if our toiler is compelled to compete with this class of labor, with more competitors available from China than twice the entire population of Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Switzerland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain?

The Chinese laborer brings here no wife and no children, and his wants are limited to the immediate necessities of the individual, while the American is compelled to earn income sufficient to maintain the wife and babies. There can be but one end to this. If this immigration is permitted to continue American labor must surely be reduced to the level of the Chinese competitor, the American's wants measured by his wants, the American's comforts no greater than the comforts of the Chinaman, and the American laborer not having been educated to maintain himself according to this standard, must either go down into a darkness

too gloomy to contemplate, or else take up his pack and leave his native land. The protection of American labor is an essential duty of the American Government; and protection against such competition is not only advisable but necessary, if we wish to continue the government we now have.

It is charged that we forced ourselves upon China, and sought her trade, and must not enforce the law from fear of losing it. This is not true. The English and the French battered down the gates of the Chinese cities; the American Government refused to be a party in the assault. If the initiative had not been taken by others China would to us have been a walled city to-day; but after the battering down had been accomplished, and other nations had been admitted to the enjoyments of the Chinese trade, our government merely asked that we should be placed on equality with them.

Much has been said about the so-called Burlingame treaty and the great promises of trade held out to us by its ratification. It matters not what our expectations were at that time; however great, they have not been realized. The inducements held out to our people by that treaty never have been justified by the action of the Chinese. We had a right to expect that the nation that had refused to be their enemy, when the great nations of the earth attacked them, should hold a better place in their estimation than their adversaries; but the experience of the last twenty-five years, since the Burlingame treaty was ratified, shows that in the matter of trade, the Chinaman permits no sentiment to influence or affect him, but buys where he can buy the cheapest, whether from his enemy or friend, and sells in the market that will take at the highest price the greatest amount of his commodities.

There is nothing in the Chinese trade, or rather in the loss of it, to alarm any American. We would be better off without any part or portion of it. For the year 1892 our imports from China amounted to \$20,488,291; our exports amounted to \$5,663,000, or a balance in favor of the Chinese of nearly \$15,000,000 for the last year. The history of the last year has been the history of the last twenty-five years, during which time we have shipped to China more than \$134,000,000 in coin, in excess of the amount of bullion and coin imported therefrom. The loss of this trade would not be injurious, and there is no possibility of China ceasing to trade with us so long as we are always a customer for more than \$14,-

000,000 of her products over and above what she takes from us. Our people have no such rights in China as we accord her people here. They have not the right to settle where they please, to engage in trade, or to indulge in their missionary work, excepting in a few of the ports of China and a few of her cities ; and if an American wishes to go into the interior of China he must do just what we ask the Chinaman to do here—to obtain a certificate of his right, and be prepared to show it wherever called for. We have to-day not exceeding twenty-five merchants in all of China. As a matter of fact, the American houses have withdrawn from that trade, being unable to compete with the other foreign houses.

The immigration of Chinese laborers has been prohibited for many years. The Pacific States are a unit against the further immigration of these people. Nine-tenths of all the Chinese in the United States are found in these States, and they have had opportunities for studying the effect of their presence, not permitted to the other States. American interests in the far West, the maintenance of American civilization, and the just protection of American labor from Chinese competition, is of more consequence than the profits of the Chinese trade, or the maintenance of missionary stations in China. The law should be enforced, for we cannot afford to have the declaration made that this government cannot enforce its laws against an alien race in the United States. It should be the duty of all good citizens to advise submission to law, and to withhold their sympathy and encouragement from those who defy the laws of the country, no matter who they may be ; because, unless there is voluntary obedience to law, or if the right of one race or class to defy the government can be justified, a precedent is established for the future which will justify similar conduct on the part of other classes and races, and, ultimately, the government, under these circumstances, unable to enforce its decrees, will cease to be able to protect those who are deserving of its protection.

All aliens residing within the Union should be taught as the first condition of their remaining here that they must obey our laws, or else leave. There is not room in this country for the establishment of foreign governments, or for races that are not willing to submit to the authority of our American laws.

T. J. GEARY.

NORWAY'S POLITICAL CRISIS.

BY PROF. H. H. BOYESEN.

THE union between Norway and Sweden is of so unique a character that it seems as if it were devised with a view to being misunderstood. I have never been able to suppress the suspicion that when Bernadotte, in 1814 (then Crown Prince of Sweden), signed the Norwegian Constitution on behalf of his adopted father, King Charles XIII., he must have laughed in his sleeve at the declaration that *Norway is a free, independent and indivisible kingdom, united with Sweden*. For, when presently, on his succession to the throne in 1818, he appointed a Swedish viceroy to direct the government in his absence, he showed plainly that he accepted the Constitution of Eidsvold in a purely Pickwickian sense. He knew well enough, old soldier of the French Revolution as he was, that a certain enthusiasm for liberty, equality and fraternity yet lingered in the air in spite of Metternich and the Holy Alliance; and he was perfectly willing to have the Norwegians deceive themselves with an illusion of freedom, as long as they left the reality of power in his hands. This, however, the Norwegians would not do. The presence of the viceroy was a perpetual irritation to them, until the office was practically though not formally abolished by King Oscar I. A free, independent and indivisible country, governed by a foreign viceroy! Was ever a more absurd pretence foisted upon a people? That it seemed less preposterous to the generation of 1814 than it would to their descendants of to-day was, no doubt, due to the fact that it presented an advance upon the former relation to Denmark, which was one of frankly acknowledged provincialism.

The terms of the union which I have called unique in political history have, as far as I know, no exact parallel or precedent. First, to guard against the appearance of dependence, the King (Charles XIII.) was *elected* King of Norway, and became actually King by accepting the conditions imposed by the Diet (Storting) of 1814, which framed the constitution. Norway, though she was ceded by Denmark to Sweden by the treaty

of Kiel, never acknowledged this cession, and contended that the sovereignty which the King of Denmark renounced reverted to the Norwegian people, which had the right to bestow it upon whomsoever it pleased. Though some indecisive skirmishing took place between Swedish and Norwegian forces, no conquest was made or claimed to have been made, and it was purely by friendly negotiation and mutual concessions that the union was effected. What might have resulted in case of war *à l'outrance* it is vain to speculate upon. Sweden was utterly exhausted by the disastrous wars of Gustavus IV., and the tremendous drain upon her resources had brought her to the verge of financial ruin. Norway was scarcely better off, being worn out by the famine of 1812, consequent upon the blockading of her ports, and having no organized army worthy of the name. Honors were therefore easy ; and it is futile to imagine what might have been, if affairs had taken a hostile turn.

Bernadotte, when he ascended the throne under the name of Charles XIV., was resolved, I fancy, to make the best of a bad bargain. The democratic spirit of the Norwegian constitution was highly displeasing to him, and he was in the habit of holding up the allies as a bugbear to the Storting, when it was rebellious and refractory. The fact was, the problem which he was trying to solve was well nigh-insoluble. He was King of Norway and he was King of Sweden ; but he was not King of Norway by virtue of being King of Sweden. In Sweden, which has an ancient and powerful aristocracy whose support he could not dispense with, he had to be aristocratic and conservative ; in Norway, which in 1818 abolished whatever remnants of an aristocracy it possessed, he could only court popularity by being democratic and radical. As the same man can not be both simultaneously the King sat down, as it were, between two chairs and failed of popularity in both countries. He tried with all his might to stem the rising tide of Norwegian democracy and to impose an hereditary nobility upon the country, but he finally had to abandon the attempt and accept the inevitable.

The Norwegians have always strenuously resisted all attempts to consolidate the two nationalities. The person of the King is the only bond of union between the two kingdoms. No Swede can hold office in Norway, and no Norwegian in Sweden. The government of Norway, in its executive branch, is carried on

through a responsible ministry consisting of Norwegians only, a division of which is resident in Stockholm, so as to be in immediate contact with the King. The only officials whom the two nations have in common are the minister of foreign affairs, who has always been a Swede, and the consular and diplomatic representatives in foreign lands, who may belong to either nation. It is this anomaly which the Norwegians now wish to abolish, and they have commenced with the claim to a separate consular service, which, if granted, is sure to be followed by a demand for a separate diplomatic service and a Norwegian minister of foreign affairs. The Steen ministry, which has just resigned, on account of the king's refusal to sanction the law incorporating the former claim, represents in its extreme form this striving of the Norwegians for an absolute and unqualified equality with Sweden under the union. The Swedish diplomacy, which practically takes no account of Norway, and rather intentionally ignores her, misrepresents the country, in the sight of the world, giving the impression that she is a mere province or semi-autonomous dependency, which has no right to be heard in the councils of the nations. And how successful Sweden has been in this systematic suppression and deception every Norwegian who has lived abroad knows to his cost. He is invariably (whether he likes it or not) called a Swede, and his protests are, as a rule, received with a smile, or, perhaps, a question as to who represents his nation in Washington or London or Berlin. When he is obliged to admit that Norway is either represented by a Swede or by a Norwegian appointed by the Swedish foreign office, it is scarcely to be wondered at that his claim to a distinct nationality is taken with a large grain of salt. Moreover, it is an open secret that promotion can be secured by a Norwegian in the diplomatic service only by subserviency to and acquiescence in this traditional policy of ignoring Norway, or subordinating her interests in all respects to those of Sweden.

It is, therefore, by no means a mere question of sentiment which is at issue in the controversy now raging between the two countries, and which threatens serious consequences.

As I have observed, the separate consular service is a mere entering wedge, and leads, by a logical necessity, sooner or later, to the larger claim of an independent diplomacy. Norway has, by the bitter experience of nearly eighty years, learned that the

present arrangement simply means national extinction ; and that the only way in which she can gain recognition from the world as a nation is by having a diplomatic and consular representation which is Norwegian and not Swedish. It appears to me that this claim is so rational that no impartial judge would think of disputing it. And if, as a matter of fact, a large party in Norway do dispute it, it is either because, having never been abroad, they cannot see themselves as others see them, or because they are oblivious of their country's grand history and pusillanimously content with inferiority and provincial subordination. Even Mr. Emil Stang, the leader of this party, who, after the resignation of Mr. Steen and his colleagues, has just formed a new conservative ministry, must be aware that a country, whose relations with its neighbors are managed, not by itself, but by one of the neighbors, is not a self-governing country, however much it may delude itself with that fiction, but a semi-autonomous province or dependency. It may be because Mr. Stang privately sees this, and only officially professes blindness, that he is said to have advised the King to approve of the consular law of the late Storthing, which, however, as minister he is bound not to urge.

It is not to be denied that the present situation is a precarious one and full of dangerous possibilities. It was a foolish and rather undignified proceeding on the part of the Storthing to cut off the King's civil list, and immediately, as if to emphasize the rebuke, vote pensions to the retiring ministry. For, being a man of honor, Oscar II., even if he were personally disposed to make concessions, could not afford to incur the appearance of having been coerced or influenced by pecuniary considerations. His position in Sweden is strengthened rather than weakened by the deliberate disrespect with which he is treated by the national assembly in Norway. And we are already beginning to observe the consequences. We hear a vociferous demand from the Swedish press to "suspend the Norwegian Constitution," which is but another way of declaring war, or forcing Norway into declaring war. But as the King is the commander-in-chief of the Norwegian army, and a considerable portion of the Norwegian people would deprecate a resort to arms, the odds would necessarily be in favor of Sweden ; and the chance is worth considering that Norway might lose whatever independence she now enjoys, and after a bloody and exhausting war be reduced, temporarily at

least, to a provincial relation. It is futile to blink these ugly probabilities. Even Björnstjerne Björnson, than whom there is no more patriotic man in Norway, sees that, with an army which is not to be relied upon, as its officers are largely conservatives and have sworn allegiance to King Oscar II., and a divided public sentiment, it would be madness to provoke an armed conflict with a country which is more than twice as populous as Norway. He has therefore wisely called a halt and counseled caution and a resort to further negotiations. But the party of the Left, which for a quarter of a century have drawn much of their inspiration from his defiant courage and bold maintenance of their national honor, are deeply disappointed at what they call his desertion, his cowardice, his truckling to Sweden, and unfaithfulness to his principles. But, to my mind, this serious summons to pause and consider consequences is the bravest act of Björnson's life; for he knew perfectly well what a storm of denunciation he would call down upon himself by antagonizing the dominant spirit within the party which he has himself been largely instrumental in creating. It is, however, the part of true statesmanship not to rush blindly ahead, impelled by a mighty enthusiasm; but to consider ways and means and with cool prevision forecast results, even when they are likely to be undesirable.

That the Swedish government realizes the gravity of the situation, and is determined to support the King in his uncompromising attitude, is obvious from the debate in both chambers of the Riksdag, April 12, 1893. A committee of the Lower House then reported emphatically against any concession to Norway's demand for a separate consular service, and the report was adopted, as the sense of the House, by a vote of 184 to 38. The discussion of the government's proposition to grant the King a certain provisional right to levy on communes and individuals for munitions of war, in case of army mobilization, was also highly significant, although the moderate counsel of Mr. Adolf Hedin then prevailed, stipulating that the Riksdag should be convoked, in extraordinary session, whenever there was cause for mobilization of the army, and that such mobilization should never be justified except for the purpose of maintaining the neutrality of the kingdom, or for defence in case of attack. It cannot, therefore, be said that the Lower House has thrown down the gauntlet to Norway or exhibited a challenging

spirit. In fact, the democracy of Sweden, which is already a force to be reckoned with, has shown a considerable sympathy with the aspiration of Norway for complete coördination under the Union, and it is only that portion of the press known as the Grand-Swedish organs (*Storsvenskar*) which, by its loud braggadocio and insults, has industriously fanned the embers of discord.

If the first Bernadotte had bequeathed to his descendants a policy of full and frank recognition of Norway's claim to equality with the larger kingdom, I venture to assert that the relations between the two countries would, to-day, have been friendly, if not cordial. No nation that is worthy of freedom will willingly acquiesce in subordination and feel grateful for whatever crumbs of self-government may be granted to it after long and acrimonious agitation. Every concession which Norway has wrested from Sweden has been secured by the most indefatigable and clamorous demand, and by an attitude of stubborn self-assertion and pugnacity. It is to this persistence in her opposition to all attempts at amalgamation and a jealous vigilance over her constitutional rights that she owes whatever measure of liberty she now enjoys. If, on the other hand, the Kings of the House of Bernadotte had comprehended and sympathized with this perfectly legitimate aspiration for coördination and equality under the Union, and appeared in Sweden as interpreters of Norwegian opinion, as in Norway they have appeared as the representatives of Swedish opinion, loyalty and gratitude would have been fostered and the two nations would have joined hands in many an undertaking in which they have now held jealously aloof. They would have presented a united and, therefore, far more formidable front than they do to-day, sundered as they are in sentiment and only held together by a hateful political necessity. But the Kings have, since the first Bernadotte and his son Oscar I., been Swedes exclusively, and by the very fact of their foreign descent they have been anxious to emphasize their Swedish patriotism and their complete identification with the interests of the larger country. It is, of course, perfectly natural that being born in Sweden they should be Swedes, and I am far from blaming them for their devotion to the cause which they conceived to be that of the country of their birth. No man can be of two nationalities, and I know no man, except the King of the House of Bernadotte, who has been placed in this difficult predicament of professing more than one.

The fact is they have rarely displayed the least comprehension of the spirit which animates the Norwegian people, and they have accordingly been unable to rise to that higher statesmanship which would have cemented the union, year by year, as surely as the policy they have pursued has strained it to the point of disruption. Oscar I. and Charles XV. had, perhaps, occasional glimpses of a deeper comprehension, and to the former Norway certainly owes a debt of gratitude. But Oscar II. has betrayed an alienism and a narrowness of vision, in his dealings with Norwegian affairs, which certainly cannot have commended him to the affection of his Norse subjects. And, if rumor be true, his son, the present Crown Prince, is still more ultra-Swedish and still more determined to chastise the "rebellious and ungrateful Norwegians" into obedience and submission.

Now, suppose such an attempt was made, and was, as perhaps it might be, temporarily successful. What would Sweden or the House of Bernadotte gain by such a victory? To keep Norway in a state of permanent subjection, which I do not believe can be done, would demand a constant expenditure of men and money which would weaken Sweden, produce unending strife and turmoil, and strain her resources to the utmost. For the Norwegians, as their history shows, are not of the stuff that slaves are made of; and it would require a far greater power than Sweden has at her command to reduce them to submission.

This is indeed worth taking into account; and there are many excellent men in Sweden who see it plainly. On the other hand, it is contended that if the demands of Norway for separate consular service and ultimately separate diplomatic officers were granted, the Norwegian minister of foreign affairs might antagonize that of Sweden, and the two kingdoms would no longer present to the world a united front. Well, nor do they now. The chances of antagonism are, however, infinitely minimized, when no cause for jealousy exists (the nations being absolutely co-ordinate), and the King being yet the superior officer of both ministers whom the envoys of both countries at foreign capitals represent. There would perhaps be one cause for disagreement where now there are a hundred, and the union which now is a grudging and compulsory one, and therefore weak, would then be a friendly and voluntary one and accordingly strong.

HJALMAR HJORTH BOYESEN.

THE FASTEST TRAIN IN THE WORLD.

BY H. G. PROUT, EDITOR OF THE "RAILROAD GAZETTE."

AT THREE o'clock on the afternoon of Sunday, May 28, I left New York for Chicago, and the next Tuesday at 11:15 in the morning I was again in New York. I had travelled 1,928 miles in forty-four hours and fifteen minutes, and out of that time had spent four busy and useful hours in Chicago. This was not done as a *coup de théâtre*, but as a simple matter of business. Any other man, or any woman either, could have done the same thing with perfect comfort and with no more fatigue than must be endured in any railroad journey of so many hours. There was nothing in the motion of the cars or in any other internal conditions to suggest that the train was running unusually fast. I wrote much of the time and made fair "copy." I slept in peace and dined in quietness, and that is more than one can often do on trains making but thirty miles an hour. It was only when one looked out and tried to pick out an individual cross-tie or to catch the fleeting mile-posts that he began to realize the smooth, swift and incessant progress that he was making over the face of the earth. For it must be remembered that while the schedule time of twenty hours for 964 miles from New York to Chicago gives an average speed of 48.2 miles an hour, this includes nine stops, of which seven are long enough to change engines and inspect the running gear. It includes also slackening of speed to take water or at grade crossings and through large towns. The average, therefore, of 48.2 miles an hour does not give the average speed in motion, nor does it give any measure of the maximum speed that must be made for short distances by a train making 964 miles in twenty hours. A great many miles must be run at over sixty miles an hour, and some miles are run considerably faster than that. In the westbound journey, of which I am speaking, two of us timed twenty-five consecutive

miles at an average speed of seventy miles an hour, and we timed one of those miles as having been run in forty-three seconds, or at the rate of eighty-four miles an hour. This record was made under such conditions that I feel warranted in accepting it as accurate. That was probably the highest speed reached on this journey, but much higher speeds have been made on the same ground and by the same engines.

The journey of which I write was made on the first round trip of the twenty-hour service between New York and Chicago, established by the New York Central & Hudson River and the Lake Shore & Michigan Southern railroads—a service which marks an epoch in railroading. It is a brilliant performance in railroad operation, and it is of real importance in human affairs. In both aspects it is deeply interesting, and to look at it merely as a bold piece of advertising, or as an enterprising attempt to draw passengers from other roads, is to take a superficial view.

When in 1881 the train time between New York and Chicago was reduced to twenty-six hours and forty-five minutes there was no great practical reason for reducing it only an hour or two more. One must pass a night and lose a working day on the journey. Bringing the time down to twenty-five hours, as was done two or three years later, enabled the man who left one city in the evening to arrive at the other early enough to dine and go to the theatre the next evening. Or, if he started in the morning, he gained an hour and three-quarters for his business the next morning. Indeed, if he were a tough traveller, and travelled merely for business, as most folks do, he would do about as well to start in the evening by a thirty-six-hour train and pass two nights on the way. By so doing he got tolerable lodgings, he lost no more business time than if he had taken a twenty-five-hour train and saved the extra fare of the “limited” trains.

But the twenty-hour service immediately introduces new conditions. It enables a man to do business in New York, in Chicago and again in New York on three consecutive days, and to get in each city a fair business day. For instance, leaving New York at three o'clock, he is in Chicago at ten the next morning. He has really been twenty hours on the way, but for business purposes he has only been nineteen, because of the difference in longitude. Then he has four clear hours in Chicago, and leaving at two in the afternoon is in New York again at

11:15 the next day. The new trains, therefore, are essentially business men's trains, and if the acceleration of speed stops at the present limit the gain in time will still be one of the most distinct and important improvements in train service that have been made in recent years. If the time can be reduced still another two hours the further advantage will be greater than has been secured in any reduction made between thirty-six hours and twenty-five; and while it is foolish to tempt fate by making gratuitous prophecies, I should not be at all surprised to see the run between New York and Chicago made regularly in eighteen hours within the next two years.

Indeed, it is a fact that when the present acceleration was first planned it was the purpose of the officers of the New York Central and the Lake Shore to make the time nineteen hours; and in the light of what they are now doing there seems to be no serious mechanical reason why they might not have fixed the speed at that point. It would simply have involved running over the Lake Shore at the same average speed as is maintained over the New York Central; and that rate has been kept up for more than twenty months, in regular daily service, with no mishaps and no serious difficulties. The speed of the Empire State Express, which was put in service in October, 1891, is 50.7 miles an hour, including stops. That schedule has been kept up with remarkable punctuality, summer and winter, through all the vicissitudes of traffic and weather. The new twenty-hour train is scheduled for exactly the same speed from New York to Buffalo, but as it does not run into the Buffalo station it has a slight advantage and its "inclusive" speed figures out 50.6 miles an hour. Over the Lake Shore, however, the rate per hour, including stops, is 46.5 miles; but if this part of the run were also made at 50.6 miles an hour Chicago could be reached in nineteen hours from New York. There is no physical reason why trains should not be run just as fast on the Lake Shore as on the New York Central. There are fewer tracks to be sure, but there are fewer trains. The grades are lighter and the line is straighter. The Lake Shore fast engines are smaller in all their dimensions than those of the New York Central and consequently have not so much reserve power to draw upon in case of cross-winds, wet rails, or delays from any of the many contingencies of railroad operation; but no company

has a monopoly of big engines. Whenever the Lake Shore officers decide that the mechanical and financial results will pay them for hammering their rails with 20,350 pounds on each driving-wheel instead of 16,275 pounds, or to distribute the weight on six wheels instead of four, they can put on engines just as powerful as those of the Empire State Express. So, whether or not we are to have nineteen-hour trains probably depends entirely upon the profit of the twenty-hour service. But a reduction of the time to eighteen hours is quite another matter. It means three miles more each hour, for eighteen hours on end, and no one in the world has done that yet, much less proved that it can be done, day in and day out, under the complicated conditions of regular passenger service.

But in speculating on the continuation of the nineteen-hour service, and on still further acceleration, one important condition, possibly the most important, has been ignored. That is the element of competition. The Pennsylvania Railroad led in the reduction to twenty-six hours and forty-five minutes, and again in the reduction to twenty-five hours; it is not likely to sit still and let its greatest competitor carry off the glory and profit of the reduction to twenty hours or less; for there is glory in it and there is a fair chance of profit. I hear it said now, and sometimes by railroad men too, that the Pennsylvania cannot make the run in twenty hours. That is pure nonsense; it is simply a commercial question. Will it pay?

The Pennsylvania would have some advantages and some disadvantages in a contest of time between New York and Chicago. Its line up the Juniata Valley is very crooked, has but two tracks and is crowded with trains; but this is also true of the New York Central's line up the Hudson River Valley; and both are well signalled and well provided with passing sidings.

The grades of the Pennsylvania over the Alleghenies are severe and the line continues crooked to Pittsburg and beyond. The Pennsylvania has to lift every ton that it hauls to a height of 2,162 feet above the sea, while the greatest altitude reached by the New York Central is 919 feet. The heaviest grade of the Pennsylvania, going from Altoona to the summit, is 95 feet to the mile, while (excepting a very short grade between Albany and Schenectady) the heaviest grade of the New York Central, on the eastern slope of the Batavia divide, is 44 feet. But the Pennsyl-

vania's track is excellent, and the line is well equipped with block signals from New York to Crestline, 189 miles west of Pittsburgh, or 633 miles in all. In all this distance the only really serious difficulties in fast running are concentrated in about 100 miles, over the Allegheny divide; and the very heavy grades are concentrated in about twenty-five miles just at the summit.

Westward from Pittsburgh, on the Fort Wayne route, which is the Pennsylvania's shortest line, there are about 260 miles of single track out of a total of 468. The normal traffic is very heavy, and the long mileage of single track is a serious element in making a fast train schedule, not because of the danger so much as on account of interference with other trains. On the 11th of last February 457 trains were moved on the Pittsburgh-Crestline Division in twenty-four hours, and sixty miles of the division was then single track. This was an abnormal condition and only lasted five days, but the whole line is heavily worked, considering the amount of single track.

These are the difficulties that stand in the way of the Pennsylvania's meeting the New York Central's time. There is no question of machinery, track or signals. On the other hand, its line is fifty-two miles shorter, which gives it an advantage of more than an hour in a twenty-hour schedule. Therefore we come back to the proposition that it is purely a business question, and the chances that twenty-hour trains will soon be run on both the great New York-Chicago lines, and that nineteen-hour trains will follow shortly, are good. The eighteen-hour trains may not come so soon as I have conjectured (there I decline to prophesy), but we shall have them, no doubt, as soon as Professor Biles's ships are ready to go from New York to Southampton in four days.*

I have said that the new twenty-hour service is a brilliant and unprecedented feat in railroad operation. This is using the words with due regard for their meaning. It is remarkable for the high speed sustained for a long distance and in that the train is run for almost 1,000 miles for through passengers only. Nothing approaching it has been attempted before in the world. In the summer of 1888 the two great lines from London to Edinburgh, the West Coast, 400½ miles, and the East Coast, 392½ miles, suddenly reduced the time to eight hours, making the speed over the

* See NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for June, 1892, "Thirty Knots an Hour to Europe."

longer route, including three stops, fifty miles an hour. This lasted one month, and the close of the month was marked by one run at 52.7 miles an hour, including five stops. Then, at the end of August, a treaty of peace was made, and the speed was dropped to forty-seven miles an hour, where it stands yet, so far as I know. This "race of the Scotch expresses" was much talked of on two continents. It certainly was an important step in the development of fast long-distance running; but the trains weighed from 175,000 to 225,000 pounds against about 400,000 pounds (or 495,000 pounds with the dining car) for the "Exposition Flyer." All these weights are exclusive of the engines. The distance run, too, was only about 42 per cent. of the run of the new twenty-hour train. But these trains were a demonstration and a stimulus. They ran over one summit 1,015 feet above the sea, with heavy grades, and made their time punctually, up hill and down. They did this with no new kinds of machinery, for some of the engines were thirty years old; it was simply a matter of careful administration. Many miles were made at much above the average speed, and one run is recorded of $76\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour for four miles. There was much outcry about the danger of such speeds, but there were no mishaps and few delays. The trials proved that with light trains, good track, adequate signals and infrequent stops, a journey speed of over fifty miles an hour could be kept up for four hundred miles without any revolution in machinery or methods.

In the next two or three years several fast trains for moderately long distances were started in the United States, particularly between New York and Washington, but the boldest and most novel step was taken here when the Empire State Express was established in October, 1891. That is like the Scotch expresses in distance run, 439 miles as against 400, with but four stops, and in being much lighter than our ordinary express trains, about 329,000 pounds exclusive of engine and tender, and in making a sustained journey speed (stops included) of 50.7 miles an hour. But it is unlike in that the engines are much more powerful than the English engines, and in that it has run without interruption and without diminution of speed for twenty months, and through two winters. From that service the twenty-hour service now established was the natural sequence.

H. G. PROUT.

FRENCH GIRLHOOD.

BY THE MARQUISE DE SAN CARLOS.

A YOUNG girl in France is by no means the gay, fresh, happy creature one is accustomed to in other countries. She is, on the whole, a forlorn little specimen of humanity, whose existence is totally ignored in society. No sooner has her very summary education been completed than she is led to several "*bals blancs*" (young ladies' parties) as an introduction to the world; after which, in the course of a few months, her parents marry her.

A *jeune fille* must dress very simply, not to say shabbily, for she must not only avoid being remarked as either pretty or stylish, she must try almost to look plain; young men not caring to marry girls who have been the least talked about, however praiseworthy their reputation.

To be courted as a young girl is most unbecoming. To be courted as a married woman is a thing universally accepted—in very good society. Young girls are invited nowhere, everything in the way of amusement being given exclusively for married women, who consider girls a nuisance, and who are always literally sending them out of the room! These poor little creatures are supposed to be so utterly ignorant of the most elementary rules of natural history that the faintest allusion to scandal in its mildest form is carefully hidden from them, and we may feel confident that the old French joke about the indecency of the study of botany for a *jeune fille* was based on fact.

It is almost impossible to give foreigners an idea of the moral swaddling bands that constrain French youth and warp its spontaneous growth. A mother's one ambition is to launch her child suddenly into the wild vortex of life utterly ignorant of its dangers; the more ignorant she is found, the more perfect is considered her education. Her mamma's anxious vigilance has followed her day by day, from the hour of her birth, until she has triumphantly placed her darling, as innocent as a new-born babe,

on her marriage day in the arms of a man the child scarcely knows by sight, and who is often a Parisian libertine, in its high-bred phase.

Is it surprising that such a bride should experience cruel disappointments and often end by seeking consolation in those forbidden attachments where heart-breaking remorse follows new and deeper disenchantments, that end by shattering belief in all love, and leave the young mother powerless in her turn to lead her child through the untrodden paths of nature's own simple laws of love?

Neither can a young man attempt to reform present customs and seek a wife of his own choice, for a gentleman is in honor bound never to court a girl without having previously asked her parents' permission, and, as the slightest attention to a girl assumes immediately in France a serious character, he must either ask this permission before knowing his bride, or he must run the risk of being shot down by a chivalrous brother, should he afterwards decline marrying within a few weeks' notice.

As I have said before, when a girl leaves school a *bal blanc* is generally given to celebrate the event, to which are invited as many other young girls as may chance to be in the market at the time being. Poor little things! How they have longed for this first *bal blanc*. They can scarcely realize that they are putting on the flimsy white gown which means future access to unbecoming plays and immoral reading, whose modest *décolletage* discloses to their blindfolded eyes visions of diamond necklaces and an endless train of admirers in the distance.

During the six, eight, perhaps ten long years these girls have spent in convent schools, how they have dreamt of this first step towards emancipation. Now at last the dream has changed into a reality, and life is going to begin in very earnest. These dainty little creatures are dressed in white and sit in rows before their mothers, dancing demurely with equally pretty young Frenchmen, whose bright black eyes, small waists and finely cut moustaches symbolize that portion of mankind out of which husbands are to be picked and chosen by kind mammas.

During the course of the evening some bold partner asks permission to conduct Mademoiselle to the refreshment room. If he be of corresponding rank, or what is considered a good *parti*, the permission is granted, the vigilant mother taking care, never-

theless, to follow the young people on the arm of some venerable contemporary, and returning with them to the identical chairs they occupied before.

Never does Mademoiselle dance more than once with the same partner, much less give a warm hand-shake to an old playmate; a ring of laughter would be shocking, and as to looking bravely into a young man's eyes, such an act of unprecedented boldness would certainly destroy Mademoiselle's prospects of marriage. But "where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise," and the little flock of white lambs goes home with burning cheeks and beating hearts to toss over great square pillows as restlessly as might an American belle after an evening of intoxicating success.

By this time we have reached the most eventful epoch in a girl's, or perhaps, would it be better to say, in a mother's life, for now must the French woman prove herself to be a clever tactician; now must she keep a good lookout and lose no opportunity to hit off the mark with dexterity if she would secure a passable husband for her daughter, who in the meanwhile spends her time taking music and painting lessons and endless walks in quiet unfrequented avenues with sedate *fräuleins* or English governesses, as the case may be, for she knows that her life of forced constraint will soon be over and that after marriage youth will at last be allowed to assert its rights.

Yes, heralds have announced the combat, and the lances are drawn. Mademoiselle has been to her first ball, and this means that, after previous consultation with the family physician, mamma has decided to marry her daughter, and has already informed one or two old friends—duchesses and marchionesses delight in the traffic—the exact amount her husband intends to allow his child in the marriage contract. The news spreads like wildfire, and bidders forthwith present themselves, not to the parents, still less to Mademoiselle, but to the above-mentioned female brokers in hearts and ducats, and settle with them the first preliminaries of the transaction.

No serious step should be taken before the dowries of both parties have been openly avowed and corroborated by the respective family attorneys, as it would be considered indelicate to ruffle young people's affections uselessly, which might happen were it afterwards discovered that their combined fortunes did not suffice to cover the expenses of such lives as both desired to lead

after marriage; in which case, however, there would not be the slightest hesitation in breaking off an engagement on the wedding eve.

If valuable woods or productive farms form a part of Mademoiselle's dowry, if some historic *château* or eagle's nest on the seacoast be her portion, these possessions are elaborately enhanced by some diplomatic relative; to say nothing of the adroit insinuations made concerning Mademoiselle's virtues; for, of course, Mademoiselle is perfection. Mademoiselle paints and Mademoiselle sings, and oh! Mademoiselle is so pious, and above all so innocent, so ignorant of life's mysteries! Here, it may be added, that mammas sometimes make mistakes; they forget how much Mademoiselle has got out of dictionaries, school companions and indiscreet servants concerning these self-same mysteries. Still, as a rule, French girls are almost too innocent; and, as none of the *abandon* which comes to the rescue of true love can exist between young married French people, who have barely met half a dozen times before marriage—it often happens that a woman never recovers the moral shock she has received in the first intimacy of married life.

But what Mademoiselle does know—be she ever so innocent—is, that all the world is trying to find her a suitable husband and consequently she looks suspiciously at every young man who comes across her path. She lives in a state of feverish excitement which soon tells on her health and the doctor orders iron pills to strengthen her constitution and double doses of music and painting-lessons to distract her mind, until at last one bright morning as mother and daughter are walking to early mass the former whispers with a look of mysterious importance: “Don't look around this morning my dear.” A shot darts through the poor young frame, for this means that *he* is to be there and all through the silent service the child heart flutters and the color comes and goes from the girlish cheeks as she knows that her future husband is looking at her, examining her figure and watching her every gesture. Strange to say she goes through emotions resembling those any other maiden might experience while waiting for a real lover, for has she not made of her future husband an ideal, and does she not see in him the realization of her secret dream of love or ambition as her womanly or worldly instincts predominate? Little does she suspect, poor child, that that very man

will examine the horse he buys on the morrow with pretty much the same sort of interest.

Womanlike, "she casts a side glance and looks down," and manages to see two cold steel grey eyes that have pierced her very soul. Yet she may not look again. He it is that must first be satisfied as to the truth of the assertions that have been given him concerning the physical attractions of his future bride. A few days later on mother and daughter are invited to tea at the Duchess de ***. As Mademoiselle drives into the courtyard of the "hotel," she wonders why the many windows of this stately palace are not thrown open on so warm a spring night, and why music and streaming lights do not float out into the darkness to welcome her and her lover.

Can he have retired his propositions? Did those cold, grey eyes find her deficient in womanly charm? Or has the family attorney given a poor account of her dowry? Perhaps her father has refused to pay his debts, and so curious are the inner folds of human nature that this pure young heart feels a pang of revolt against paternal justice; for she had heard her aunt aver that any young man worth having nowadays must be head over heels in debt before he makes up his mind to marry?

Fortunately, Mademoiselle has no need for alarm. Her lover awaits her. The house is closed because the duchess would never have proposed a presentation of so delicate a nature at one of her brilliant receptions—the rendezvous of fast young married women. No; she has organized a party *en petit comité*, and has invited only a few discreet members of both families.

This time it is Mademoiselle's turn to look at the young pretendant before giving her consent, though her acquiescence is merely a matter of form, a truly modest, well brought up *jeune fille* never questioning the choice made by her parents, far less attempting to study a man's character or to examine his physical attractions. Still, it is considered necessary that both parties should have met before publishing the engagement, lest any insurmountable antipathy or repugnance should be produced on first sight. Should this happen, however, and the worldly advantages of the marriage be otherwise very important, relatives will soon manage to dislodge such like obtrusive notions and drown all opposition in the excitement of matrimonial preparations, an engagement never lasting over a few weeks.

There is something so touching in youth and love that though such a meeting as that which takes place at the Duchess de ***'s is but a mockery of these heaven-born gifts, it happens, nevertheless, as Mademoiselle enters the duchess's gorgeous drawing-room in her soft silver grey foulard with a pink rosebud in her hair, that mamma's hands are tremulous and the hearts of old maiden aunts beat faster while the girl, as one in a dream, drops her pretty French courtesy and primly answers the dowager's questions in set old-fashioned sentences. For a few moments the duchess does a great deal of talking all by herself which permits those present to recover their self-possession, while the young man's beaming smile shows that he is charmed with Mademoiselle and considers her susceptible of great improvement as soon as toilet and expensive dressmakers are called into requisition.

Presently the dowager thinks it is time to break the ice and, in a loud whisper, asks Monsieur le Comte to present Mademoiselle with a cup of tea, simultaneously distracting general attention from the young couple by sending emissaries in various directions laden with cakes and refreshments. During the suppressed commotion produced by this military manoeuvre the young people have managed to exchange a few words concerning the weather or the influenza. Then music makes a break, until refreshments come once more to the rescue, again a little music, and mother and daughter retire with the same stately courtesies they made at their entrance.

Early the next morning Mademoiselle hears the roll of the duchess's old coach under the portal ; she knows that now at last the final decision is coming. The count has found her adorable, is glad that she is not penniless—would not have married her had she a farthing less—and craves to be accepted as her affianced lover. He has no *château* ; but in exchange, his fortune is superior to hers, and his family of equally aristocratic lineage.

Mademoiselle would have preferred black eyes and a husband taller than herself, but, as her aspirations are not of a more serious nature, her mother easily overcomes such vagaries by adroitly leading her attention to the all-engrossing question of the trousseau. The next day the newly-betrothed maiden goes to the opera comique, which, by the way, often takes the place of church for these Fausts' first vision of their brides. The *fiancés* exchange a few

more meaningless words during the performance, after which the count gives his arm to "mamma," while mademoiselle rests on her father's, and all solemnly leave the opera box for the carriage door.

On the whole, matters advance pleasantly, and, notwithstanding unusually long conferences between the family attorneys, no serious difficulties ensue. The property is in pretty good condition; revenues on both sides are in solid three per cent. government bonds, and the few thousands in miscellaneous stocks are classed A No. 1. "*Tout marche sur les roulettes.*"

The Count is delighted with the information he receives concerning his bride's *château*, which happens to be precisely what he wanted, either in a good hunting district, if he be a sportsman, or on a pleasant seacoast, if he be a member of the yacht club. Mademoiselle, on the other hand, is dragged round to dressmakers and *fournisseurs* of every description till she verily longs for her marriage tour as a respite. During all this time our "lovers" meet frequently, though not always every day, and ever with the same pompous decorum observed at the duchess's and at the Opera Comique.

The parents and family lawyers have likewise attended to every detail relative to the marriage contract, stipulating not only the amount which is to be allowed Mademoiselle for her pin money after marriage, but even the city or country place where the newly-married couple are to spend their summers and winters, and six weeks from the day that stranger watched the graceful child during her morning devotions in the darkened aisles of some beautiful old church do they pass out under the same gothic arches, arm in arm, as man and wife, never more to be separated, according to the laws of their faith, by any human power, be their failings ever so great, or their disappointments ever so cruel.

LOLA DE SAN CARLOS.

INTERNATIONAL YACHTING IN 1893.

BY GEORGE A. STEWART, DESIGNER OF THE "PILGRIM."

HAD anyone ventured the prediction, during the summer of 1892, that the next season would see nine new 90-foot sloops striving for supremacy on both sides of the Atlantic, he would have been considered to be a person of a very highly developed imagination. In previous years an America Cup challenge has succeeded in bringing out one, or, at most, two defenders. But here, by means of the cross challenges that have been issued, we see the unprecedented number of nine new single-stickers of the largest size, all built to achieve the highest speed yet attained in craft propelled by sails.

It is a magnificent fleet, and it is a pity that the circumstances of the case prevent a meeting of all in the same contest. The spectacle of nine cutters of the largest size contending for one prize would be the grandest that ever delighted a yachtsman's eyes.

It has become the fashion lately to say that with the perfection of steam, and, further still, electricity, the sailing yacht will soon be a thing of the past—that in the hurry and bustle of modern civilization the uncertainty of the sailing yacht must give way to the speed and schedule time accuracy of the steam or electric yacht. I predict, on the contrary, that the sailing yacht will continue to increase in popular favor. The sporting instinct is highly developed in man, and with the trial and approval of the recent great improvements in the speed of sailing yachts, the stimulus will be felt to still greater advances. There is no excitement so rare as that of a close and well-sustained contest, and the racing of steam-propelled craft has never satisfied this feeling. The varying changes of the weather, the opportunity afforded for the triumph of personal skill in the management of wheel and sails,

and of correct judgment of the best course to be taken, all these things combine to make the racing of the sailing yacht one of the highest forms of sport known to man. These conditions appeal to the cruising men as well. The very uncertainty of the time when port can be reached, with its added pleasure of formulating new plans, and exploring untried harbors, adds zest to the cruise of the leisurely yachtsman, and he would laugh at the idea of exchanging his fickle but satisfying plaything for the 16-knot-an-hour steam yacht. For the busy man, steam yachts will still continue to increase and fill a very necessary part in the economy of pleasure navigation, but I believe that they will fill their own sphere without affecting the progress of the sailing yacht.

Mr. Carroll's plucky challenge to the British fleet drew attention to the big sloop class last fall, and when this was followed by Lord Dunraven's spirited challenge for the America Cup, the interest grew fast. The Prince of Wales commissioned Watson to design him a racing cutter, so that the designer of the "Thistle" will have two representatives, the Prince of Wales's "Britannia" stopping at home to defend the Cape May and Brenton's Reef cups and the Royal Victoria Yacht Club Cup from Mr. Carroll's "Navahoe," while Lord Dunraven's "Valkyrie" crosses the Atlantic to do battle for the America Cup in our waters. Not content with this, a Scotch syndicate commissioned Designer Fife to put the "Calluna" in the lists for them; and, lastly, Designer Soper got a chance, and "Satanita" made the fourth British yacht to be built.

Meanwhile matters dragged here in America. A syndicate of New York yachtsmen commissioned Designer Herreshoff to build a yacht for the cup's defence, and many were inclined to let the matter rest there. The idea of "not carrying all the eggs in one basket," however, had sufficient force to induce a second New York syndicate to lodge an order with the Bristol firm. Still the feeling of insecurity continued, as but one designer was represented in the two boats. General Paine thereupon entered the lists, and finally a syndicate of Boston yachtsmen commissioned Stewart & Binney to design a yacht to represent the Hub.

Secrecy, at least in the primary stages of a yacht's development, has become the rule among designers. For this reason the exact facts as to the different yachts are not yet public property, but the main features of nearly all have become pretty generally known.

The four British yachts, "Valkyrie," "Britannia," "Cal-luna" and "Satanita," judging from what little is known about them on this side at this writing, appear to be craft of considerable similarity of type. All are represented as being keel boats, there being no centreboarders or fins among them; all are boats of large sail-carrying power and several of them are represented as exceeding the "Volunteer's" sail plan considerably.

It is in this matter of sail plan that the British fleet will show the greatest divergence from former practice. Heretofore trans-Atlantic designers, encouraged somewhat by their rules of measurement, have striven to attain the highest speed with small sails and hulls of small resistance. The "Thistle" was a bold departure from British practice, yet even she was inferior to the "Volunteer" in sail spread. Another point that is noticeable among the new British yachts is the manner in which the masts have been moved forward, which gives a large area of mainsail, and, thanks to the modern system of long overhangs, a very short bowsprit.

The American craft show no such similarity in design. The "Navahoe" is more or less on the order of the American sloop as represented by "Volunteer," though "Navahoe" is deeper than "Volunteer," has the full lines and long overhangs that have now become fashionable both here and in Great Britain, and also carries a sail-plan by the side of which that of the cup-defender of '87 seems modestly small. The Rogers syndicate boat is a deep keel yacht of about 24 feet beam and 16 feet draught, and is modelled after the 46-footer "Wasp." The Morgan-Iselin syndicate has built a centreboard boat of 26 feet beam and 12 feet draught. The Rogers and Morgan-Iselin boats carry enormous sail plans.

General Paine, with the aid of his son John, has designed a modified fin boat. She has the canoe form of the fin keel, and the fin with a bulb lead keel bolted to it, but through the fin a metal centreboard plays. The Paine boat has a beam of about 22½ feet, and a draught in the neighborhood of 14 feet. The Boston syndicate's contribution to cup defence is of the fin keel type, though she also has a centreboard, which in this case is a small steering contrivance, and is put in well forward. Her beam is about 23 feet and her draught about 22. All the American yachts will be about 85 feet long on the water line, with an over-

all length of upwards of 120 feet, and the English boats will not differ much from these figures.

All the American boats, at least, are of the sort which the friends of the new order of things will call "racing yachts," and the enemies "racing machines." That is to say, in none of them has the idea of cruising comfort been allowed to interfere with the freedom of design. Speed is the one object aimed at in their construction. Not but that all could be converted into cruisers, and doubtless will be at the close of the racing season. Still, the high power of the Herreshoff boats, necessitating large sails, and therefore large crews, is not in the line of best cruising comfort, and the same may be said of the Paine boat, as her sail-plan is represented as being not so much smaller than those of the Herreshoff boats. The draught of the Stewart & Binney boat puts her out of consideration as a cruiser, as she now is, but with her draught decreased she could be converted into a cruiser which would have the advantage of being able to attain good speed with a very small sail-plan, a desirable object in a cruising yacht. Still, the question of adaptability as cruisers has not been considered very seriously in building this year's cup-defenders, and they will be judged by their speed as racers.

At this writing the British boats have already had half a dozen races, and it is satisfactory to note that the "Valkyrie" seems to be at or near the head of the fleet in speed. It would be small honor to beat her on this side, if she were unable to do creditable work in her own waters. So far, the "Valkyrie" and "Britannia," the two Watson boats, have justified the prediction of their designer, that they would be about equal in speed, as each has won a couple of races, and they usually have finished within a minute or two of each other. The Scotch syndicate boat "Calluna" has suffered through the carrying away of her mast. This accident, necessitating a green stick, is a serious handicap, but so far "Calluna" has not shown herself the equal of the Watson boats. "Satanita," the Soper craft, has been behind the others in preparation, and so far she has not shown to the front. The new boats have beaten the "Iverna" sufficiently to stamp them as fast boats, though just how much it is necessary to exceed the "Iverna" to reach the "Volunteer" standard it is hard to estimate. As these lines are penned none of the American cup-defenders has been tried under canvas. "Navahoe" has been sailed, and

with her "tenderness" cured bids fair to give a good account of herself in foreign waters.

The development of the America Cup defenders is a history full of interest to the thoughtful yachtsman. With the building of "Papoose" in 1887 the tentative process in American designing may be said to have been inaugurated. For the next three years, the 40-footers held sway, and many problems of form, ballasting, light construction and rigging, were worked out. This class culminated in the keen racing between "Gossoon" and "Minerva" in 1890, the fine little Fife cutter having more than held her own against the whole American fleet for two seasons. In 1891, the 46-footers, by far the swiftest class of yachts built up to that time, compelled the admiration of yachtsmen, and the success of "Gloriana," "Harpoon" and "Wasp" have furnished ideas which are thoroughly incorporated in the fleet of 1893.

But, strange as it may seem, the class which has done the most for the cup-defenders of 1893 was one of comparative pigmies—the Boston 21-footers of last year. Judged by the speed of our corresponding classes here and abroad this class of 21-footers may well lay claim to being the fastest class of yachts ever built.

All the designers of the cup-defenders of this year had representatives in the 21-foot class, and the lessons of that keen competition are easily seen in the big 90-footers. It seems almost absurd to base a fleet of 90-footers on the performances of so small a class as 21-footers, yet the experiments made in the 21-foot class were so original and the results so striking that the temptation to adapt the ideas from the small to the large craft was irresistible, so that the cup-defenders of 1893 embody more original features than any similar large fleet ever built, and most of these original features had their first expression in the 21-foot class of 1892.

Previous to 1892 the distinction into keels and centreboarders had been sufficient to distinguish the types of yachts, but with the introduction of the new 21-foot class, keel boats, bulb keel boats, fin keels, narrow centreboarders, wide centreboarders and weighted centreboarders—all these terms were needed to distinguish the various types that were contending together.

The lessons to be proven from the big sloop racing of 1893 are incalculable in their number and magnitude. In the case of the two Herreshoff cup-defenders we have the experiment of sail-

plans which are enormous compared with that of "Volunteer." The two Boston boats will show the possibilities of the fin-keel type—the form which gives the maximum of sail-carrying power to the minimum of displacement. The Paine boat will work out the problem in conjunction with a big sail-plan and a centre-board, with moderate draught of fin, while the Stewart-Binney craft clings more closely to the original idea of the fin, namely deep draught of fin-plate and moderately small sail-plan.

In construction, too, light weight of scantling and light rigging have been carried to an extreme never before attempted. The Morgan-Iselin boat has a Tobin bronze bottom, being the first vessel that has ever used this material for plating. While adding greatly to the expense, it insures a smooth bottom. Sails of a high grade of cotton are to be used on all the American cup-defenders, by means of which the weight of a suit of canvas for a 90-footer is considerably reduced. All these experiments, while they add greatly to the possibilities of speed, also increase in like manner the possibilities of failure. It is to be hoped that every one of the boats will be successful in showing the possibilities of her type, in which case it is fair to assume that all will be considerably faster than "Volunteer" was in 1887, and that the chosen defender will show a turn of speed hitherto unapproached.

The season in Great Britain is sure to be full of interest. The racing there is in full swing, and the British idea of circuit racing, in which each racing yacht "takes in" nearly every race that is sailed in the United Kingdom—racing one day and cruising to the next port the next, sometimes sailing all night in order to take part in races that are sailed on consecutive days—this plan insures a satiety of racing even for the most enthusiastic owner and crew. Doubtless they will institute trial races similar to ours, by which their best boat will be selected to meet the "Navahoe." The English yachtsmen have still our Cape May and Brenton's Reef challenge cups in their possession, which were won by the "Genesta" when she was here in 1885. They will strain every nerve to keep these trophies, as well as their own Royal Victoria Yacht Club Cup, from the hands of the covetous Yankee.

Our racing season is very different from that of the English. To begin with, our cup-defenders were all started so late that they

will hardly be in form by the first of August. This will prevent any racing till the beginning of the New York Yacht Club cruise, and the Goelet Cup race is likely to be the first meeting of all four of our defenders. That race will be looked forward to with keen interest, and the winner will feel proud at having secured the first point in the competition for the honor of being the one chosen to meet the "Valkyrie."

Besides the cruising runs, there will doubtless be other races off Newport, cups for such races having been already offered by Mr. John Jacob Astor.

The races for the America Cup have been set to begin October 5, and as they are to be best three out of five this year, instead of two out of three as formerly, it is likely, with the usual number of postponements on account of fog or lack of wind, that this date will bring the close of the series well into October, which is pretty late for yachting weather. It is possible that an earlier date may be set, as Lord Dunraven has asked for such a change, but as all our boats were late in starting, it is probable that the cup committee will be sure that no harm is done to any one of our cup-defenders before acceding to the challenger's request. Should all our boats be in readiness, however, it is likely that the cup races may be set for an earlier date some time in September.

Whatever the date of the final races, the trial races for the selection of the American champion must be held at some time between the close of the New York Yacht Club cruise and the date of the final races. As the trials will take up considerable time, and as a period of preparation is necessary for the trial races, and also considerable time will be needed for the chosen yacht to prepare for her final effort, it is probable that there will be little spare time after the close of the New York Yacht Club cruise, and the trials and final races are likely to furnish most of the racing that the cup-defenders will be able to enter.

While the race for the America Cup will be the chief event of the year, the trial races of our four cup-defenders will furnish rare sport. Should the yachts be evenly matched, the racing between our own boats would be fully as exciting as the cup races, and the evolutions of four such mammoth single-stickers, with the splendid seamanship which is sure to be developed, will be well worth witnessing.

The final races themselves will repeat these splendid specta-

cles, and without doubt the cup races of 1893 will draw the largest attendance and excite the liveliest interest in the history of international yacht competition.

A word is in place about the sportsmanship of the owners who have contributed to make this great fleet a success. For the mere glory of a friendly competition a fleet has been built, representing an outlay which will be a large percentage of a million dollars. It is an ephemeral thing, and the owners well know that, with the progress nowadays made in yacht building, all of the present fleet are likely to be out-built by another year. If funds are furnished by private enterprise so readily for the mere generous rivalry of an international sporting event, it can readily be believed that the patriotism of the Anglo-Saxon race will be equal to any test to which it may be subjected.

GEORGE A. STEWART.

THE AMERICAN CORRESPONDENCE OF LORD ERSKINE.

WITH NOTES BY THE HON. STUART ERSKINE.

It is not too much to affirm that the unhappy condition to which Great Britain was reduced at the end of the last century is without parallel in the annals of that country. That such a condition conspired, moreover, to render imperative some of the most desperate expedients and some of the most courageous exploits ever recorded in the history of mankind, let alone of any single nation, is equally true. In fact, no previous epoch in British history can sustain a successful rivalry with it in wealth of stirring incident.

It was at this period, when the nation's hopes were lowest, when national bankruptcy seemed imminent, invasion a pre-ordained necessity, and disintegration inevitable, that Thomas Erskine, the famous Lord Chancellor, addressed the first of the following letters to his eldest son David Montague,¹ who was then residing in America. My ancestor, contrary to advice, had invested the greater part of his very respectable fortune amassed at the English bar—where his services in behalf of civil and religious liberty had earned for him imperishable fame—in the American funds, believing that this course was the best means of hereafter securing for himself and his family a monetary sufficiency appropriate to their position in life. His connection, however, with America, though in the first instance a material one,

¹ David Montague Erskine married the daughter of General John Cadwalader, of Philadelphia, in 1800, and had a large family. He was destined by his father for the bar and was called to that profession in 1802, but he had neither the genius nor energy which marked his father's character. He lacked that natural inclination to the subject, which is the only passport to success, and without which study and application can avail nothing. He lived to disappoint his father's expectations in respect to his legal pursuits, and to become British Minister at Munich.

was not limited altogether to a commercial instinct, but was conducted according to a principle he had ever professed and exercised, that of extending his approbation and affection to all, irrespective of nationality, that should have the liberty and well-being of their country and the freedom of their political institutions intimately at heart.

The correspondence of Lord Erskine, so far as it goes, is valuable as illustrating the state of Great Britain, and indirectly that of the United States, at the period in which the letters were composed, and as expressing the opinions of a most remarkable man concerning a young and remarkable nation.

In 1798 Lord Erskine, or rather Thomas Erskine, for he was not elevated to the peerage until the year 1806, was of opinion that his American property required that personal supervision and attention which he was prevented by the exigencies of a public career from giving to it personally. So it was resolved that David, being the eldest son and therefore the child most intimately concerned in the success of his American investments, should proceed on a mission to the United States, in order that he might act as his father's mediator and representative in that country. The letters that follow tell their own tale. The first of these homilies is addressed to David Erskine as he was on the point of leaving England, and is as follows :

LONDON, August ninth, 1798.

DEAR HOMO²: I have this moment received your letter. By a letter from General Smith to your mother to-day it turned out, as you said, that he had applied to Sir Sydney, which was friendly in the extreme. My courses at the cockpit stand over till to-morrow, & as I could not at soonest have come away till Saturday, I have given up coming to Portsmouth altogether, as I have no doubt at all that the wind will be round to the east by the new moon on Saturday.

I sent you yesterday packets of letters from Mr. King, 5 in Number. So that your credentials are now as complete as possible. I would have you before you leave Portsmouth take care that you have a proper legible Pen & ink, & I advise you to get a few little red Books for taking memoranda as they occur to you, which you may make use of & transplant into your letters, & it will be by far the best way always to have a letter upon the stocks, carrying it on from day to day as anything material occurs with a fresh date; and as I shall preserve them, you may put in them everything which you would wish hereafter to remember, & it will besides give you the most useful of all habits, a turn for observation & the power of recording them. Besides, it may be very serviceable to you hereafter, if it

² A nickname which occurs frequently throughout these letters. I cannot speak authoritatively as to its origin.

appears to your friends here to whom I shall read what is material that you are making good use of your time & are in a course of improvement. As to your proceedings in America I trust everything to your Prudence; you will see men of all parties & opinions & you will have this comfort, that what agitates them will only be amusement & instruction to you, as it is not your own country. You will be able to judge for yourself the feelings & opinions of the wisest part of America & will thereby be better able to estimate the merits of the Great Political actors than by going with any preconceived opinions concerning them. With regard to your manners: *Let them be as frank & open as possible.* I would have it uppermost in my thoughts—it is of such immense importance—when a Man is of a certain Rank & of good feelings it never can degenerate into forwardness, & it does more to reconcile the world than all the other qualities put together which the best & wisest man can possess. Not forgetting that nothing is so decisive of success in the Law. Let me advise you not to travel with Englishmen. You will see them when you return. It is the vice of Englishmen that they herd together in all countries, & come back with their old Ideas. There is no rule without partial exceptions, which must depend on circumstances—but if anybody should wish to fasten upon you, & there is an awkwardness arising from it, you may say that I particularly asked it to be a rule with you. This is the more necessary because America is at present the receptacle of the vagabonds & blackguards of all countries, many of whom in their litigations & distresses will introduce themselves as acquaintances of mine. It is one of the uses of travelling to know how to deal with all these things. I forgot to say that you may tell Church that if you want money at New York before you go to Philadelphia I shall be particularly obliged to him if he will put you in the proper course.

.
Your affct. Father,

T. E.

For God's sake remember NAILS.³

The following letter contains its own explanation. Although no date is attached to it, it was clearly written on receipt of David Erskine's first communication announcing his safe arrival in America:

DEAR HOMO: I was very agreeably surprised by receiving your letter, as from the universal prevalence of Westerly hurricanes, from the date of your letter from Corke, I rather expected to hear of your being put back to Ireland, or of being driven to Norway, than of your arrival in America. I think you judged nicely in going to Norfolk, and having got an excellent map of the U. States on a large scale I shall be sorry if you do not go to the Federal City in your way to Philadelphia, as it seems to lye in your way, and will besides protract your arrival at Philadelphia till the season of safety.

³ Referring to David Erskine's finger nails, which he was in the habit of wearing longer than was either necessary or convenient.

I have the kindest letter in the World from Phineas Bond, who had received your letter. You cannot possibly have a better and a more faithful guide, and I am sure you will place great reliance upon his advice & judgment. When you have finished my business in America I leave it entirely to yourself the extent & duration of your Tour—Let it depend upon your comfort and the sensation you have of being in the course of rational improvements. Whether you return this autumn or the next—I leave entirely to yourself.

It was rather unfortunate that I purchased at the moment I did, as the funds in the phrenzy of Nelson's victory, the use made of that glorious event ought to have had a directly contrary effect, rose up 15 per cent., and the American falling 5 made a difference of about 20 per cent., so that if I had sold & bought at that critical period it would have made the difference of £5,000. However I do not repent what I did, as our intervenient escape from total ruin could not be rationally anticipated, and the funds have since fallen down again and are likely to sink lower.

The letters that follow are very similar in phrase and sentiment and not at all difficult to understand. Happily the gloomy prognostications contained in them were not destined to be fulfilled, although at the time there certainly existed ample probability that they would be verified.

MY DEAR HOMO: Your hint about the American funds is prudent, & fit to be most seriously attended to, & I therefore send you a power of attorney which will place my fortune there under your management. Nobody can have so strong an interest to fulfil the trust with prudence. The only restriction I put upon your discretion is this:—Not to sell upon distant speculation of Evil, but upon fair emergency & approach of danger. I would not, to be sure, be caught in the storm, but I would not throw my goods overboard until the danger is imminent. I use this simile because you will recollect, my dear Homo, that the last activities of my life are over. That I cannot expect to be able greatly to increase my property, & I must therefore take care to make it yield the most. If I sell, there is a dreadful loss of income, and you besides only contemplate the danger nearest to you; & as to Phineas, it is like speaking of colour to a blind man to attempt to shew him the dangers of the British funds & of all British property. The danger is most imminent. If there be peace, I am safe in America; If there be no peace, no man is safe for an hour in England. When you wrote your letter in April you did not look forward to what has since happened. I send you the best account of my speech on Bonaparte's proposal that I can find. I spoke near two hours, & you may therefore judge how imperfect it is. It made a great impression—so great a one that Pitt was obliged to get up & let Fox be behind him. Nobody spoke but Fox & myself on our side. To return to the subject of American Funds—I send you out fresh certificates. I had bought them before I received your letter, otherwise I would not have bought them. Before this you must know that Bonaparte passed the Alps in person, & reconquered Italy in one Battle which led to a capitulation of the whole Austrian Army. Whilst Masséna has entered Munich, driven the Elector of Bavaria from his capital, & is pursuing his course to Vienna, unless he is stopped by a peace—For nothing else can save

the Emperor or the forms of the ancient European government. My pamphlet begins to be a prophecy.⁴

Your affectionate Father,

T. E.

HAMPSTEAD, July 11th, 1800.

JULY 16TH, 1800.

. . . I write these few lines to say that I wish on no account to part with a single shilling of my American funds except under the pressure of past and imminent alarm for British property, the approach of which I can safely trust to your discernment. But I would rather lose the whole of it, and begin the world *de novo*, than be such a driveller as to trust a guinea of it to the funds of this undone country, I mean undone under its present system. I know perfectly well what I say, and they will be marrying and giving in marriage when the rain begins to come upon the earth. There is not the most distant prospect of peace, nor the least awakening of the people to the inevitable consequences of a protracted war whilst a ministry composed for the most part of absolute paupers are supported by the landed and monied interests for the utter ruin of all the resources of the nation. . . . The Emperor has rejected Bonaparte's proposal of peace. New subsidies are to be raised, and in my next letter you will hear of the fall of Vienna,⁵ and probably of the invasion of Ireland, which the French have certainly not abandoned, and in which they must succeed if they ever invade with an army, which they are now preparing to do. . . . P. S. I think I see by authentic news to-day a glimmering of a general peace.

LONDON, August 13th, 1800.

. . . Since you wrote to me on the subject of the stock, I have taken the greatest pains to investigate the state of American security from the most unexceptionable quarters; and I have even seen a letter written from the prison of Philadelphia from Mr. Cooper, who was convicted of libel on Adams, your President. I know Cooper personally, and have a great opinion of his abilities. He agrees with you that Jefferson will be President, but he sees no danger to the American government from that circumstance; yet I confess the fate of your government itself is the only thing with which I can connect an apprehension; for as to confiscation I cannot give faith to it, and I take it for granted that in the present state of America it is a most improbable event. Besides, trusts in such cases are never hunted out. The law is barely complied with. Neither nations nor individuals commit desperate and despicable pecuniary frauds; but under pecuniary pressures, to which America must be a stranger for many years to come. She will have a peace with France, though not directly. As to Great Britain, I see nothing but ruin staring her in the face. The people have totally lost their characteristic spirit, and if they had any spirit left the existing laws prevent the expression of it. Either an immediate continental peace will take place, and that before you can receive this, or else the

⁴That on "The Causes & Consequences of the War with France." It ran through 48 editions.

⁵The treaty of Lunéville (Feb. 9th, 1801), however, disappointed Lord Erskine's anticipations. Vienna was saved indeed, but the frontier of the Rhine was again ceded to France.

flame of war will be rekindled, and the political fabric of Europe will be finally consumed to ashes, and with it all the monopolies of this long favored country. I have seen so much of half politicians here, that I should think my property safer under Jefferson than Adams. Jefferson is an enemy to the crooked politics of England, but if England's government is administered with common sense America cannot be her enemy.

PORTSMOUTH, Feast of St. Michael, 1800.

. . . What the devil can possess you to admire the perseverance of our *once* glorious country, which you still stile glorious. Perseverance to connect itself either with common sense, or wisdom, or virtue, must be perseverance in what is right. The words for the contrary vice are obstinacy—infatuation—Blindness. The war never had an object but to perpetuate the ancient system of Tyranny & superstition which enslaved the world for centuries, & which would have enslaved the whole of it still, if Great Britain had not broke loose from it in the last age which gave birth to all her greatness till touched by the corruption which I am afraid is inseparable from it. She set about replunging the world (if she could) in the gulph from which she had escaped & from which other nations were escaping. She began with America & was defeated. The attempt & the defeat emancipated France by its example & its consequences, & in the attempt against France she has been defeated again. Depend upon it, if the war continues, This country is, without a figure, undone, undone in every sense in which the term can be applied. The inhabitants of this country are starving, & of course shaken loose from all sound connection with the state, and they only can live who are the plunderers & oppressors of the public. You will scarcely know England when you come back, but in the beauty of the fields, & the highly cultivated life which attends a corrupted and enslaved country to its very grave. In Hampstead you will see no change except that the laurels & trees next the road shut out the public which gave me all I want, and the kitchen garden, which has half ruined me, now promises to be my greengrocer throughout the year. . . . Phineas & yourself write like mere children. You know nothing of the desperate state of England. You (know) of her by times that are past. I see you thoroughly understand my instructions. Nothing but necessity most imminent, of which you cannot be mistaken, would induce me to sell my stock, & I would rather lose the whole of it than have it in the funds of this country—because I cannot, with my eyes open, run my fortunes upon a rock when it stares me in the face. I will not become a Landholder in America whilst her Laws of alienage remain; but I will immediately if she changes them; which Phineas seems to expect. . . . I have not changed any sentiment I expressed to you, but my opinion of the prosperity of America and a dawn of great happiness for her I am confirmed in. I do not mean as a country for living in, but for keeping the means of living in until the horizon of Europe after the storm shall be cleared up. I cannot see through it yet.

FEBY. 1ST, 1801.

DEAR HOMO: I consider the election of Jefferson in the light I did before. I think it **HIGHLY** beneficial to America & likely to support the union. I should have thought so still more strongly had the parties not run so nearly even. Depend upon it, David, the principles of the Federalists as you describe

them to me are not favourable to American greatness or liberty. Under the present circumstances of the World an alliance with France of the most cordial nature is true interest of the United States. It would be wise to adopt it without breaking with England, because universal peace is the true policy of all nations; but with regard to England under her present establishment, at all events under her present administration, she does not deserve the name of a nation, & I think it probable that I shall be obliged to stop your coming to England in the summer, if no peace takes place, as it would be unwise to come over to be witness to a foreign invasion & a revolution. I scarcely know what to write to you about my stock, because I think it in danger Here or with you. If this administration, this accursed administration, continues, there is no asylum for a Briton upon the face of the earth. I may be confiscated in America, tho' I have opposed all the violence which will provoke the quarrel, & I may be confiscated here by the blowing up of the funds; because my property is not sufficient to invest in Lands, which besides are scarcely worth holding from the taxes which load them, & which will soon make every man in England a mere tax-gatherer for government. As things are at present, with all my prosperity, I cannot save a farthing in the year and am even in debt at the end of it. You know that We are going to War; indeed it may be said We are already engaged in one with Russia, Prussia, Sweden, & Denmark, in addition to our former Enemies, France, Spain, & Holland, France having its foot on the neck of Germany. This war we begin with the funds at 5 per cent., famine stalking thro' the land, and the lower orders wholly disaffected. The King is too weak & prejudiced to be capable of feeling the situation to which his trust in wicked men has reduced the country, and the people seem to be quite indifferent to the consequences. It is this state of things that reduces me to a very great difficulty in determining what is best; but nevertheless a determination, & that an *immediate & distinct* one, must be made; *you* must know much sooner than *I* can whether America means to adhere to the Northern Confederacy or not. If She does not, I do not see any other probable cause of quarrel with England; if She does, my stock must be absolutely sold if trusts are doubtful, which probably they will be, because if She adheres to the Confederacy our Madman will stop her shipping, & America will retaliate by confiscating British property.

I wish the climate of America was a good one & the manners of its inhabitants something different. For England is *UNDONE*. Bond is quite bigotted on this subject & *will not* see the condition of this country. I wrote to you the catastrophe of my Estates left to me by A Stranger.⁶ An ignorant Scoundrel of an attorney destroyed the public intentions of the

⁶ In a letter from the Hon. Thomas Erskine to his son David Montagu in America, dated Jan. 13, 1801, he says, in regard to the matter:

"You will, no doubt, have seen in the newspapers that a gentleman had considered me in his will. I had never seen him, but after the payment of legacies, he left me his beautiful estates, one in Leicestershire, the other in Derbyshire. He was tenant in fee simple, and his will duly executed; but unfortunately the ignorance mixed with fraud, thro' out towards me, of a country attorney has destroyed everything but the fame of this bequest. The Testator owed two thousand pounds; and this attorney, instead of raising it by mortgage, began selling little outlying bits of the Derbyshire estate; and, merely from the rage of making deeds to put money in his own pocket, under pretence of making a better title to the purchaser of a mill, suffered a recovery of the whole Derbyshire estate, and although the deed was to the testator in fee simple, which absurd rule this stupid beast of an attorney had never heard of. The recovery applied to but one estate, which was the largest, and it threw all the legacies on the other, which devours it to the bone, and leaves me nothing but *the honor*."

Testator. Perhaps it is intended that my lot is not to be cast in this Land. I send you out some books, which I wish you to read attentively from the moment you receive them; as if you are to come over, the Court of Chancery must be your forum. . . . Read immediately Milford's treatise, Then Fonblanque & then Coxe's Pease Williams. I foresaw great inconveniences on your first coming over, your wife very young & a total stranger here, yourself devoted to laborious attentions; & an immediate establishment, however small, to create & keep up. I have provided against all this until you are fairly launched. . . . You have therefore everything to content you. Farewell. We send our united love to all of you.

Your affectionate father T. ERSKINE.

I have compressed into the comparatively limited place at my disposal such of these letters as seem to me most appropriate to a short magazine sketch of this character. Others of course remain; but those which have been given will, no doubt, suffice to arouse public interest in America in a man, who, by his own showing, entertained at one time serious thoughts of emigrating to the United States, and who is justly regarded in Britain as the greatest forensic orator of ancient and modern times.

STUART ERSKINE.

NATURAL HISTORY OF THE HISS.

BY LOUIS ROBINSON, M. D.

ONE of the most alluring and elusive problems which tantalize the student of evolution is the cause of the rise of the Mammalia from the reptilian world of the Secondary Epoch. We have no sufficing knowledge of the factors of environment to justify us in propounding a dogma ; but it is evident, from the remains of the earliest warm-blooded animals which have come to light, that they were a feeble and underling race. Air, earth and water swarmed with devouring foes. The only chance for the weak lay in concealment, or in an agility of limbs and wits surpassing that of their pursuers. Now, continued muscular activity involves great chemical changes in the tissues ; hence the necessity of a rapid circulation of the blood and means for its efficient purification. Some cold-blooded air-breathers are capable of extremely quick movements, but none can keep them up for long together. The creatures in which the blood was more perfectly aerated were better adapted for the rapid emergencies of life than the others, and consequently those which had ample lungs and a four-chambered heart would save themselves in life's running battle when the older type failed.

Most interesting is it to look back to the constant dividing of the ways which have led us and our fellow inhabitants of the earth to such different existences. It would seem that at that critical epoch it was a query whether activity or sluggish concealment would give the weaklings the best chance of survival. The race is not run to the finish, for in life's handicap the final heat is indefinitely postponed ; but if you want to estimate the relative progress on the diverse tracks, take note of the most perfect woman of your acquaintance and of the mottled toad which dwells in your garden. Let all Tories digest this hint of the final outcome of their principles.

It is a truism of history that a struggling race develops quali-

ties which enable it in the end to conquer. The thieving goat-herds of Latium, perpetually at strife with the folk on the far side of the next hill or rivulet, after long ages of conflict evolved a force and valor which subdued the world. The sparse clansmen of the Highlands, for centuries at one another's throats about matters which a county court judge would settle in a couple of minutes, now wield an influence over civilization entirely out of proportion to their numbers. The Jews, trampled in the mud of the Ghetto, and gasping for bare existence throughout the dark ages, hold the key of the treasury of the Eastern hemisphere.

It is only through great tribulation that we enter into any kingdom, whether earthly or heavenly. The remote history of our own race fades back into darkness which neither legend nor philology does much to illumine. But this law teaches us that the indomitable vitality of the Anglo-Saxon peoples is a sure index of a prolonged and desperate grapple with adversity on the part of our early forefathers, which, though not recorded in words, has left its impress forever on the fibre of our minds and muscles.

But to return again to the earlier mammals. They undoubtedly came of a cold-blooded preëxisting stock, and were evolved in a reptilian environment. Not only their derivation (as comparative structural anatomy proves) but also the obstetric agencies involved in their initiation into being, have left an indelible birthmark upon all warm-blooded creatures. The war between the newer and older orders was "to the knife," and was continued throughout whole geologic epochs so vast that it is futile to try to reckon them by our standards of time. No wonder that the trail of the reptile is across all nature, from the instincts of the hog to the devotions of the saint! We probably owe more to this coercive spurring from below than it would suit our dignity to admit. Yet, when we come to think of it, Nature is alive with instances of the development of what are deemed noble attributes through the humiliating impetus of a *vis a tergo*. There can be no doubt that the speed and endurance of the horse is directly traceable to the fact that, for countless generations before he came under human influence, he had to flee for his life from the wolves of his native steppes. And in like manner many qualities which have helped our species to its present supremacy may have had their origin in the dire exigencies of that pristine war. Our passions, our affections, our aspirations—

the very spires and pinnacles of our moral nature—rest on mundane foundations as ancient as the Mesozoic rocks.

It may take a little of the bounce out of our inflated and pachydermatous conceit to be reminded that, if we are nearer the goal than formerly, it is because we have been well kicked by a team of urgent circumstances ever since the ball of life was first set rolling.

The whole subject of reptilian residual influences is so vast and obscure that it will be well for present purposes to leave the enticing twilight of speculation for a while and to examine a few facts that may serve to illustrate the theories put forward. For this purpose some particulars concerning the impress left on birds and mammals by the contest with snakes (the most successful warriors of the reptilian host) will, I hope, prove both useful and interesting, especially as some of the observations have never before been recorded.

Let us take as a starting point the strange instinctive terror of the serpent which nearly all animals exhibit. It is not the result of individual experience, for experience, after receiving the venom of a cobra or a fer-de-lance, may be deemed a negligible quantity. It is inherent and is as much a part of the organism as the skeleton or the desire for food. Its universal distribution asserts its extreme antiquity.

Into the origin of the terrible perfection of the snake we cannot here enter. He is one of Nature's triumphs of specialism, and he had progressed along his narrow ophidian groove of development for millions of generations before even the most primitive mammal came into existence. It is evident that he himself must have been at one time hard beset by the stress of hostile environment to have evolved such a unique efficiency of fang and coil. Yet the very supremacy he has won in his own line of life has spoiled his chance of higher adaptive progress. The shifts to which the more defenceless and versatile beings have been put to dodge imminent destruction (and which have resulted in such startling consequences as the human intellect), his lithe agility and his fearful armature enabled him to eschew with disdain. He now inherits the lot of a narrow and militant conservatism in a progressive age. On his belly shall he go and dust shall he eat all the days of his life.

It seems probable that the feeling of shuddering repulsion we

have for all cold and crawling things is part of our share of this inherited instinct, which is itself an echo of the ancient feud. A man who was constantly handling snakes told me that although he had no fear of them, yet he experienced a thrill of intense aversion whenever he placed his hand on one. His rational mind had concluded a peace with the Ophidia, but his more animal and primitive nervous system had not, and had to be coerced into an outward acceptance of the treaty. One notices even among the birds and beasts which destroy serpents a kind of exaggerated excitement when they are in the presence of one which they do not display when they attack other kinds of quarry.

Among our kinsmen the apes the dread of snakes is universal; and is as much exhibited by those bred in captivity as in those freshly caught. The other day I transformed a savage old male *rhesus macacus* which was tearing at his cage to get at me, with crimson face and gnashing canines, into a limp and pallid coward by the exhibition of a Japanese toy snake which I had in my pocket. Practical naturalists who have to do with strong and fierce monkeys occasionally resort to a similar stratagem in order to intimidate them. Mr. Rudyard Kipling introduces this fact into one of his tales, and makes the caretaker of an orang-outan, on board ship, gently hiss like a serpent whenever his charge became too obstreperous. I have tried the same experiment with apes of various kinds, and invariably with immediate results. The suddenly arrested movements and startled timorous look at once betrayed how much the mind of the beast was agitated by that uncanny sound.

Is it not strange that, throughout all nature, from the desolate swamp to the opera-house radiant with electric light, a hiss is an imitation of hostile intent? And that it invariably sends a flutter of apprehension through the nerves of the hearer? An actor who was great in the part of the ultra-villain in melodrama said that he never heard the hisses with which the gallery applauded his quasi-turpitude, without an uncomfortable momentary shudder, although he well knew that the sound was meant as an expression of the most sincere appreciation of his talents.

Does not the novelist make his arch-reprobate *hiss* his curses when his demoniac emotion is too intense for shouting? Is it not possible that political audiences are unconsciously guided by a deeply-seated animal instinct when they greet the unpopular

orator or sentiment with a storm of sibilation? Of course the speaker or actor knows quite well that the auditorium is not (except metaphorically) a nest of serpents, just as the keeper of the reptiles at the zoölogical gardens knows that a harmless snake will not kill him when he handles it; but the disconcerting *aura* comes all the same, and the hiss generally serves its purpose. I have taken pains to let a monkey see that my toy snake was only made of paper, yet the next time it appeared from my pocket he sprang back involuntarily just as at first. Darwin states that although he knew that a sheet of thick plate glass was between him and an enraged cobra, he could not help jerking his head back every time it darted towards him.

Why does a snake hiss? It has been suggested that the sound is at times caused by the rapid expulsion of the air from the long bladder-like lung at the moment of attack, so that the reptile may be enabled to dart with greater rapidity, "like a cast lance," upon his enemy. If so, it was at first a plain, though quite involuntary intimation to his adversary that he was "just going to begin", and gradually came to be a threat; just as the taking off the coat is deemed a proper demonstration of intention among pugnacious boys when provocation has reached a certain pitch.

I hope at some time, if professional work permits, to complete an essay on the sounds uttered by animals (and men) in expressing their various emotions, and to trace these back to their basis in Nature. In this article it will not be possible to attempt a more detailed analysis.

What other evidence have we that the hiss among warm-blooded animals has an ophidian origin? Is it not an instructive and significant fact that in *all departments of the animal kingdom* creatures which make their homes and rear their young in hollow trees and such-like places make a hissing noise when one attempts to explore their strongholds? Owls, tits, bats, some woodpeckers, marsupial phalangers and dasyures, opossums, cats, and many others not connected by appreciable blood relationship, have this curious habit. Every widely-spread instinct or attribute such as this is of the most intense interest to naturalists, for it is in itself sure evidence of some far-reaching evolutionary influence.

One can easily understand that a prowling carnivore which anticipated the presence of something edible in a hole would con-

sider twice before inserting a "privy paw" when he heard that blood-curdling threat. If his muddle-headed intelligence enabled him to weigh the *pros* and *cons* of the dilemma (which is improbable), he might argue somewhat in this way: "There may be a dinner up yonder, but then again there may be sudden death. It smells like kittens, but it sounds devilishly like a snake. This investment is too risky for a beast with a wife and half a dozen cubs. I will try another hole."

Dame Nature is a most excellent economist. She allows nothing to go to waste. If impetuous evolutionary agencies produce an inch of stuff more than is required for the immediate purpose, it is at once pounced upon and utilized in another part of the establishment. Does a butterfly develop a nauseous flavor, so that the gizzards of insectivorous birds turn queasy at the very sight of it? Other and sapid butterflies, in the same district, mimic its shape and color; and, thus disguised, secure immunity from attack. Does a bird prove himself a tough antagonist so that his enemies gladly leave him alone? Other birds, especially feeble ones like those of the cuckoo family, imitate his shape, plumage, and manner of flight.

It is a queer household that the old Dame rules with so wide an eye to the main chance and such Martha-like solicitude as to petty details! Her children are as virginally unconscious of design as the snowflakes; yet their days and nights are spent in all the bizarre disguises of a *bal masqué* with more than a suspicion of a basis of sordid intrigue.

It would indeed be a matter for surprise if so frugal a housewife as Nature allowed the wide-spread fear of the snake to remain a waste product. So called Protective Mimicry is considered rare among the higher vertebrates. I am inclined to think that closer observation will show that it is commoner than naturalists imagine. Let us consider a few particulars about the one animal which is familiar to us all, from among the list of those that breed in dark holes, to wit, the cat. They are scarcely conclusive enough to form a working theory upon, but at the same time they are very suggestive.

Several observers have remarked that the head of an enraged cat, with its flattened triangular outline, its exposed teeth and obliterated ears, and its glinting eyes with their slit-like pupils narrowed to a mere line, has a strikingly viperine appearance.

Its hiss—short explosive bursts or longer harsh expirations—is exactly like the sound vented by certain snakes when about to strike. It faces its adversary, and behind its fore-shortened body, waves the mottled tail in quick sinuous curves—utterly unlike the wagging of the tail of a dog—in precisely the same manner as that in which the hinder ends of all snakes move when they are excited. The enemy, probably one of the *canidæ*, which are all timid of serpents, might know that it was a non-poisonous mammal all the time, and yet the dreadful *suggestio falsi* might easily disconcert him just enough to shake his self-confidence and to give the cat the advantage.

Nor is this all. The true tabby cats (those with wide black markings) have, in nine cases out of ten, the stripes so arranged that when they are curled up asleep they present exactly the same appearance of a coiled serpent. My wife's favorite cat "Gwendolen," a very handsome half-bred Persian, first drew my attention to this fact as she lay on the hearth rug in my study. On the flank is an oval dark mark, which forms the centre of the concentric rings, and which might easily be mistaken for a snake's head as it lay coiled for a spring.

Since my attention was thus drawn to the subject I have observed many tabbies, and find that in nearly all those of this type the markings have the same distribution. On looking further into the matter I found that in several very noteworthy instances the markings of cats from various parts of the world almost exactly corresponded in *width, color and pattern*, to the markings of the formidable snakes of the country they inhabit. This is remarkably so in the case of the smaller ocelots, which are covered with r'band-like bands that might almost have been printed on a tawny background from the mottled skin of a *crotalus*. The larger cats of the same family, including the jaguar, have variegated curved marks on them resembling those of the South American boa-constrictor. These mottled bands are so arranged that when the animals are asleep, in the usual attitude of the *felidæ*, they form concentric curves, either circular or oval.

Now I am willing to admit that all this may be mere coincidence, and certainly the jaguar (although he is only a bloated ocelot) does not seem in need of any special protective coloring. It is difficult also to see what kind of danger menaced the slumbering cats which could be warded off by a serpentine aspect. Still,

taken with other facts, and considering the possible lapse of time and change of environment since the fashion of wearing a snake pattern commenced, the resemblances appear to merit further attention.

In some other departments of natural history there can be scarcely any doubt that an actual mimicry of the snake has been resorted to on account of the immunity it afforded. Nearly all long-necked birds, especially those which nest in the sedge or jungle, will hiss and dart out their sinuous necks in a very snake-like way when an intruder approaches. This may be observed in any duck or goose which is sitting, although the habit is, I believe, rare among birds which breed in Arctic regions. Travellers in the pampas have been unpleasantly startled by the realistic acting of the brooding rhea when he thus assumed the reptilian rôle to intimidate a trespasser who approached too near the family nest. Here again the foes to be warned off are chiefly of the fox and wolf tribe; but the cats, in spite of their own ophidian strategy, are not proof against the terror inspired by the snake.

It has often struck me as a curious instance of the indelible character of inherited instincts that the domestic hogs imported into America (and which are of mixed European and Chinese stock) should at once assume the offensive against the rattlesnakes and other formidable reptiles of the New World, with an address and a system of attack which show that this kind of warfare was familiar to them. This instance serves to prove to us that the impressions received by the nervous organism countless generations ago remain an important factor in modern life. It is akin to those *vestigial reflexes* to which I have repeatedly alluded to in my papers on ancestral traits in infants (published last year in England and Germany), which, I understand, have attracted nearly as much attention in the United States as in Europe. Among the experiments which I tried in the course of those investigations were some in which I endeavored to ascertain how far the intense instinctive horror of the serpent shown by the *Quadrumana* was exhibited by very young children. The results were interesting and suggestive, but I have not, as yet, considered them conclusive enough for publication.

Did space permit, many other instances could be brought forward of the profound influence of such instincts throughout all

departments of life. Can we doubt that the part played by dragons and snakes in superstitions and primitive philosophies, all the world over, is traceable to such a cause? We must recollect that in former times,—and in those not far beyond the margin of history,—the reptilian inhabitants of the earth were far more numerous and formidable than they are to-day, and took a much larger and more sinister place in the every-day life of men and beasts.

It is a suggestive fact, to say the least of it, that in the version of the legendary Human Drama upon which our Western ideas are so largely founded, the Evil Principle makes his first appearance as “The Serpent.”

LOUIS ROBINSON.

THE FAMILY OF COLUMBUS.

BY HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF VERAGUA.

ALL nations endeavor to perpetuate the remembrance of those men who have contributed to their aggrandizement, both as a tribute of gratitude to their memory and as an example to future generations. Even in democratic societies the names of their most illustrious citizens will always be honored. Washington will always be the symbol of North American independence; Lincoln will continue the representative of the redemption of millions of men who were groaning in slavery; Grant and his companions in arms will always be remembered as those who maintained the unity of the country.

The benefits of the work of Columbus extend to the whole of the human race. To Spain belongs the glory that the discovery of America was made under the banner of Castille, and yet Spain did not directly reap the advantages of that memorable event. The West Indies afforded large opportunity to its people for satisfying their inborn spirit of adventure—Cortez, Pizarro, Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, and many other Spaniards, in their romantic exploits rivalling the legendary heroes of antiquity—but this took away from the Peninsula strength which was much needed there after a struggle of seven centuries to regain its territory. At the same time, the treasures which came from America, far from encouraging agriculture, industry and commerce, served only to feed external wars, waged with the idea of maintaining the splendor and power of all the dominions which had been united under the crown of Charles V., King of Spain and Emperor of Germany.

It is, therefore, not surprising that the history of Columbus is considered as belonging to all nations and that his name should be equally venerated in every one of them. It can also be

easily understood that in America his memory should awaken greater enthusiasm at the present time, when the country is celebrating the success of his daring enterprise by the Columbian Exhibition. The festival of the Quadri-centennial has naturally aroused universal interest in all that relates to the life of Columbus. Scientific works have been multiplied in all the centres of erudition, and learned men all over the world have labored to bring to light a figure which humanity views with eagerness, desiring to dispel the obscurity which has ever enveloped it.

The city and the date of Columbus's birth have long been a matter of dispute; the events of his life are unknown, until at a ripe age he appears in Portugal engaged in cosmographic labors. The time he passed in Spain before his first voyage is also surrounded by fancies which obscure historical truth; fancies such as that with regard to the supposed enmity of the theologians of Salamanca, that robs the Friar Dominicus Diego de Deza of all the importance which Columbus himself attributed to him when he affirmed that "after God and the Queen, to him is due, principally, the discovery"; and also, with regard to Doña Beatriz Enriques and her supposed marriage with Columbus in order to legitimize her son, Don Fernando. It has been impossible to determine exactly the house in Valladolid in which he drew his last breath, and it has been even pretended that his remains do not rest in the sepulchre which the piety of Spain destined for them.

It is impossible to find valuable data concerning these questions on which to base a clearer conception than has hitherto existed, and it would be a thankless task to attempt to elucidate them, at the same time that it would be foolhardy to pretend to decide them with a final authority.

The visit of Columbus's descendants to America, on the invitation of the People and the Government of the United States, has excited some curiosity and it may not be out of place to give some account of the history of the house of Veragua. The titles of nobility that this house enjoys at the present time, and by which it is known, were not given to Columbus as a reward for his services, but, on the contrary, were granted as a compensation for the withholding from his house of those dignities and benefits which were their due.

The discoverer of the New World had a solemn agreement

with the sovereigns as to the reward of his services. The Queen agreed without hesitation that Columbus and his descendants should have the tenth part of all the products which should come from America, but she objected most strongly to Columbus's exercising any authority in the territory discovered, as, even though his authority were exercised in the name of the sovereigns, this would constitute a division of the royal power. This was not vain ostentation on the part of Isabella, but she deemed it necessary in order to maintain the political unity realized by her after a desperate struggle against feudalism, and not to compromise the national unity obtained by the conquest of Granada, the last refuge of Mussulman rule.

This was the reason why the negotiations were broken off and why Columbus abandoned the Court of Castille, with the intention of going to France or England; but such was the enthusiasm of the Queen for the enterprise that she caused him to return and acceded to his requirements, signing on April 17, 1492, at Santa Fé, a small town near Granada, the articles which conceded to him the tenth part of the revenue from the Indies and, under the title of Admiral and "Adelantado Mayor," the authority he had desired to obtain for himself and his descendants.

The efforts of the Admiral's enemies to have him displaced, or to make use of the power which he was exercising, are well known. The remembrance of those facts which so embittered his life has served to tarnish his memory with the applause of the detractors of Spain. Envy and bad passions have existed and will exist at all times and in all countries, and a grave injustice is committed by supposing that these pettinesses of the human heart constitute the distinctive elements in the character of Ferdinand the Catholic. Although he was a prince of exalted mind, he was also the representative of the ideas of his time with reference to the royal authority. A disciple of Machiavelli, in his policy he made use of the resources of astuteness and cold calculation. He was never dazzled by the glory of the enterprise of Columbus, and he was not willing that the grandeur acquired by Castille should cause public business to be directed into channels that he deemed dangerous and of but slight benefit to the interests of Aragon. Not so much from hatred of Columbus as from political motives, he saw with perfect indifference the existence of a spirit of distrust of the Admiral and the ignoring of his services.

While the Queen lived, Columbus obtained satisfaction for his wrongs, but when she died he was left to struggle alone, and, overcome by years, by sorrows and physical sufferings, at last succumbed in poverty, leaving as a patrimony to his family an immortal name, an example of patience and Christian resignation and a wealth of expectations.

His son, Don Diego, was too near the sovereigns to demand, and too far from them to obtain, what the discoverer of a world had claimed in vain, though supported by legitimate rights. He was page of Prince Don Juan, and was afterwards a prominent figure in the court of Doña Juana, on account of the splendor of his name in conjunction with that of his wife, Doña Maria de Toledo, who was niece of the Duke of Alba, one of the most distinguished persons of that epoch, and one who achieved glory for the Spanish monarchy.

Don Diego died without having obtained recognition of the rights stipulated for in Santa Fé. Circumstances rendered it inconvenient for the rulers of Spain to pay attention to these matters, occupied as they were with the attempts to establish the German ascendancy, which the country rejected, and with the wars carried on in France, Italy, Flanders and Africa by the Emperor, Charles V., whom it was not easy to persuade to give up a part of his dominions. The widow of Don Diego devoted herself to watching the interests of her son, Don Luis. The latter was not specially adapted to press with energy the claims which his mother had made, and resigned himself to the idea of relinquishing them, accepting an arbitration, which was intrusted by the Emperor to Cardinal Garcia de Loaisa, Archbishop of Valladolid. The Cardinal declared that the government of the Indies did not belong to the descendants of Columbus and that, in order to avoid disputes with regard to the amount of the tenth part of the products of those regions, there should be given to Don Luis and his successors an estate of twenty-five square leagues on the coast of Veragua, which Columbus had discovered on his last voyage, when he touched Central America. Property in land and cattle in La Vega of Santo Domingo was also secured to them. At this time (A. D. 1537) the titles of Duke of Veragua and of La Vega, with the dignity of Grandee of Spain, were created, and they were granted to D. Luis Colon, grandson of Christopher Columbus, as compensation

for renouncing all the rights and privileges agreed to by the Catholic sovereigns before the discovery was made.

Twenty years after the last-mentioned arrangement, and when it had but just begun to take effect, another modification was made, in the reign of Philip II. (A. D. 1557). The Veragua property and that which was granted in Santo Domingo were taken back by the crown, and in their place D. Luis Colon received the island of Jamaica, in plenary dominion, with the title of Marquis of Jamaica. Later, in 1713, by the treaty of Utrecht, Spain ceded the island of Jamaica to England, and since then the descendants of Columbus have been deprived of all right in the continent discovered by the founder of the house, their rights from that time being represented exclusively by the honorary titles of Admiral and "Adelantado Mayor" of the Indies, Duke of Veragua and of La Vega, and Marquis of Jamaica; and for the maintenance of these dignities certain revenues were granted to them, which, according to the laws now in force in Spain, have to be divided among all the children, and so diminish with each generation.

The Admiral believed that he was leaving the future of his family assured, and he founded an entailed estate so that his name might be perpetuated through the ages, arranging the order of succession after his eldest son, D. Diego. In this matter, also, what he wished for did not happen.

D. Luis Colon left an unhappy record in every way for his family. During his life the most distinguished marks of pre-eminence which constituted the heritage of the family were lost, and on his death began those legal difficulties which lasted for two centuries. His son Christopher died before him and the courts declared that the eldest of his daughters should succeed him; but she became a nun and transmitted her rights to the second daughter, whereupon Christopher's son, Diego, began a suit which was ended by the marriage of the two pretendants, who died without issue and were succeeded by the younger daughter of D. Luis, the wife of D. Jorge de Portugal, Count of Gelves, and a member of one of the branches of the Royal House of Braganza. The Duchy of Veragua remained in this family for several generations. Doña Catalina Ventura Colon y Portugal, sixth Duchess of Veragua, married Jacob Fitz-James, second Duke of Berwick and Liria. The titles of Veragua and Liria continued united for two generations more, until 1796 when they were sep-

arated and the Duchy of Veragua came into the possession of D. Mariano Colon de Toledo y Larreategui, the representative of the direct line through the grandson of D. Luis, who died in obscurity in Santo Domingo, when the title passed to the Countess of Gelves, it being supposed that the male line had become extinct.

In the long lawsuit which had been going on, the House of Gelves and, more especially, that of Liria had been able to exercise great influence in putting obstacles in the way of justice. They obtained a suspension of the proceedings just when the question was on the point of being decided, and in this way it would have been continued indefinitely but for the intervention of D. Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, a person of great prestige, owing to his having contributed to the social and political movement begun in Spain during the reign of Charles III., under the influence of those ideas which later resulted in France in the Great Revolution.

D. Mariano Colon formed a close friendship with Jovellanos, and when the latter became acquainted with the condition of the suit that was being carried on by the former against the Duke and Duchess of Liria, he took charge of the matter and procured a definite decision from the tribunals in favor of the legitimate successors of the Admiral. They were, however, unable to obtain possession of the revenues allotted to the House of Veragua, this being prevented by the war of independence in Spanish America. Things were in this state when D. Mariano Colon was succeeded by his son, D. Pedro. Brought up under the greatest hardships, he set out in the struggle of life armed only with his intelligence to procure him a livelihood. His severe training enabled him soon to restore to his family some of its former splendor, by rendering his country important services which were rewarded with great honors. His name occupied a place in the political history of Spain, and he was considered to be one of the best informed on matters pertaining to agriculture and cattle raising. He was several times Deputy and finally Senator of the Kingdom. A short time before his death he received the order of the Golden Fleece, one of the most highly appreciated of all decorations, and one which the Kings of Spain confer only in exceptional cases, the number of those who can wear it being limited. In 1867 it was my lot to succeed him, through the sad privilege of inheritance,

and to receive in my person the honors paid to the name of Columbus, in commemoration of the discovery of America.

To these mysterious workings of Providence I am indebted for the hospitality which the American people have extended to me. I shall never forget the kindness which has been shown me, nor my visit to this beautiful country, where Nature has been so prodigal of her gifts and where man, by his labor, has been able to increase his wealth and attain a degree of prosperity which is truly marvellous. These honors, however, will not arouse in my heart feelings of vanity. On the contrary, I hope that the remembrance of this important period will increase in me a sense of the immense responsibility of those who bear honored names, and who are under the moral obligation to transmit them, at least untarnished, to their successors; and I trust that God will enable me to carry out this object.

THE DUKE OF VERAGUA.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

AN UNPUBLISHED SPEECH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

THE following is a speech of Abraham Lincoln delivered in Chicago on the evening of the city election, March 1, 1859, and now first written out from my old shorthand notes. A great crowd of Republicans had gathered at Mechanics' Institute Hall to hear the reading of the returns from the different wards by Mr. N. B. Judd, the Chairman. About nine o'clock Mr. Lincoln, accompanied by Mr. Leonard Swett, entered the hall. He was received with an uproar of enthusiasm and his speech listened to with eager interest. This was Mr. Lincoln's first public utterance since the campaign of 1858 and the debate with Judge Douglas. During that campaign Mr. Lincoln had been severely criticised by anti-slavery men, especially by some of the clergy in Chicago, for saying in his Charleston speech that he would not favor negro citizenship in Illinois. He had also said in other speeches that the fugitive slave law was a constitutional and binding law, for which he was savagely denounced by Boston anti-slavery men, Wendell Phillips calling him "the slave hound of Illinois." To this he makes a brief answer in this speech, the only time he ever referred to these charges, and his answer is in his characteristic spirit of good sense, good temper and conciliation.

Early in the previous year, 1858, as the senatorial contest in Illinois approached, many Republicans of national reputation, Mr. Burlingame, Mr. Colfax, Mr. Greeley, and, it was said, Mr. Seward, had favored the fusion of the Republicans of Illinois with the Douglas men to reelect Senator Douglas, between whom and President Buchanan a bitter quarrel was raging over the Lecompton constitution of Kansas. The Illinois Republicans, under the lead of Mr. Lincoln, made a straight contest against Douglas and in favor of the direct prohibition of slavery in the Territories by Congress. The Republicans carried the State by about 4,000 popular votes, but Mr. Lincoln was beaten in the contest for the Senate, Judge Douglas being elected by the Legislature, which had been carried by the Democrats, notwithstanding the Republican majority, on account of the apportionment. The course of Mr. Greeley and his friends was never criticised by Mr. Lincoln during the canvass, but in this speech five months later he vindicates the course taken by himself and the Republicans of Illinois, and shows the error of Mr. Greeley and the Eastern Republicans, and the fatal consequences that would have followed had the Illinois Republicans taken their advice and adopted Douglas as their leader.

A year later, in 1860, after Mr. Lincoln had been nominated for President, and the national campaign was at its height, I saw Mr. Lincoln

at Springfield and read over to him the notes of this speech, which I had taken down the evening he delivered it, but which had never been published. He listened to it carefully, and then said that as it contained comments upon the course of Mr. Greeley which would tend to awaken a discussion now past and closed, and as Greeley in the *Tribune* was then doing magnificent work for the cause, it would be better to let the speech go. On this suggestion from him I laid the note-book aside and never read it to any other person.

During the summer of the last long vacation of Congress, in turning over a quantity of old papers at my home, I came upon this note-book, and have written out from the shorthand the speech made thirty-four years ago.

ROBERT R. HITT.

MR. LINCOLN said : I understand that you have to-day rallied around your principles and they have again triumphed in the city of Chicago. I am exceedingly happy to meet you under such cheering auspices on this occasion—the first on which I have appeared before an audience since the campaign of last year. It is unsuitable to enter into a lengthy discourse, as is quite apparent, at a moment like this. I shall therefore detain you only a very short while.

It gives me peculiar pleasure to find an opportunity under such favorable circumstances to return my thanks for the gallant support that you of the city of Chicago and of Cook County gave to the cause in which we were all engaged in the late momentous struggle in Illinois. And while I am at it, I will through you thank all the Republicans of the State for the earnest devotion and glorious support they gave to the cause.

I am resolved not to deprive myself of the pleasure of believing, now, and so long as I live, that all those who, while we were in that contest, professed to be the friends of the cause, were really and truly so—that we are all really brothers in the work, with no false hearts among us.

For myself I am also gratified that during that canvass and since, however disappointing its termination, there was among my party friends so little fault found in me as to the manner in which I bore my part. I hardly dared hope to give as high a degree of satisfaction as it has since been my pleasure to believe I did in the part I bore in the contest.

I remember in that canvass but one instance of dissatisfaction with my course, and I allude to that, not for the purpose of reviving any matter of dispute or producing any unpleasant feeling, but in order to help get rid of the point upon which that matter of disagreement or dissatisfaction arose. I understand that in some speeches I made I said something, or was supposed to have said something, that some very good people, as I really believe them to be, commented upon unfavorably, and said that rather than support one holding such sentiments as I had expressed, the real friends of liberty could afford to wait awhile. I don't want to say anything that shall excite unkind feeling, and I mention this simply to suggest that I am afraid of the effect of that sort of argument. I do not doubt that it comes from good men, but I am afraid of the result upon organized action where great results are in view, if any of us allow ourselves to seek out minor or separate points on which there may be difference of views as to policy and right, and let them keep us from uniting in action upon a great principle in a cause on which we all agree; or are deluded into the belief that all can be brought to consider alike and agree upon every minor point before we unite and press forward in organization, asking the co-operation of all good men in that resistance to the extension of slavery upon which we all agree. I am afraid that such methods would result in keeping the friends of liberty waiting longer than we ought to. I say this for the purpose of suggesting that we consider whether it would not be better and wiser, so long as we all agree that this matter of slavery is a moral, political and social wrong, and ought to be treated as a wrong, not to let anything minor or subsidiary to that main principle and purpose make us fail to coöperate.

T. J. J.

One other thing, and that again I say in no spirit of unkindness. There was a question amongst Republicans all the time of the canvass of last year, and it has not quite ceased yet, whether it was not the true and better policy for the Republicans to make it their chief object to reelect Judge Douglas to the Senate of the United States. Now, I differed with those who thought that the true policy, but I have never said an unkind word of any one entertaining that opinion. I believe most of them were as sincerely the friends of our cause as I claim to be myself; yet I thought they were mistaken, and I speak of this now for the purpose of justifying the course that I took and the course of those who supported me. In what I say now there is no unkindness even towards Judge Douglas. I have believed, that in the Republican situation in Illinois, if we, the Republicans of this State, had made Judge Douglas our candidate for the Senate of the United States last year and had elected him, there would to-day be no Republican party in this Union. I believed that the principles around which we have rallied and organized that party would live; they will live under all circumstances, while we will die. They would reproduce another party in the future. But in the meantime all the labor that has been done to build up the present Republican party would be entirely lost, and perhaps twenty years of time, before we would again have formed around that principle as solid, extensive, and formidable an organization as we have, standing shoulder to shoulder to-night in harmony and strength around the Republican banner.

It militates not at all against this view to tell us that the Republicans could make something in the State of New York by electing to Congress John B. Haskin, who occupied a position similar to Judge Douglas, or that they could make something by electing Hickman, of Pennsylvania, or Davis, of Indiana. I think it likely that they could and do make something by it; but it is false logic to assume that for that reason anything could be gained by us in electing Judge Douglas in Illinois. And for this reason: it is no disparagement to these men, Hickman and Davis, to say that individually they were comparatively small men, and the Republican party could take hold of them, use them, elect them, absorb them, expel them, or do whatever it pleased with them, and the Republican organization be in no wise shaken. But it is not so with Judge Douglas. Let the Republican party of Illinois dally with Judge Douglas; let them fall in behind him and make him their candidate, and they do not absorb him; he absorbs them. They would come out at the end all Douglas men, all claimed by him as having indorsed every one of his doctrines upon the great subject with which the whole nation is engaged at this hour—that the question of negro slavery is simply a question of dollars and cents; that the Almighty has drawn a line across the continent, on one side of which labor—the cultivation of the soil—must always be performed by slaves. It would be claimed that we, like him, do not care whether slavery is voted up or voted down. Had we made him our candidate and given him a great majority, we should have never heard an end of declarations by him that we had indorsed all these dogmas. Try it by an example.

You all remember that at the last session of Congress there was a measure introduced in the Senate by Mr. Crittenden, which proposed that the pro-slavery Le-compton constitution should be left to a vote to be taken in Kansas, and if it and slavery were adopted Kansas should be at once admitted as a slave State. That same measure was introduced into the House by Mr. Montgomery, and therefore got the name of the Crittenden-Montgomery bill; and in the House of Representatives the Republicans all voted for it under the peculiar circumstances in which they found themselves placed. You may remember also that the New York *Tribune*, which was so much in favor of our electing Judge Douglas to the Senate of the United States, has not yet got through the task of defending the Republican party, after that one vote in the House of Representatives, from the charge of having gone over to the doctrine of popular sovereignty. Now, just how long would the New York *Tribune* have been in getting rid of the charge that the Republicans had abandoned their principles, if we had taken up Judge Douglas, adopted all his doctrines and elected him to the Senate, when the single vote upon that one point so confused and embarrassed the position of the Republicans that it has kept the *Tribune* one entire year arguing against the effect of it?

This much being said on that point, I wish now to add a word that has a bearing on the future. The Republican principle, the profound central truth that slavery is wrong and ought to be dealt with as a wrong, though we are always to remember the fact of its actual existence amongst us and faithfully observe all the constitutional guarantees—the unalterable principle never for a moment to be lost sight of that it is a wrong and ought to be dealt with as such, cannot advance at all upon Judge Douglas' ground—that there is a portion of the country in which slavery must always exist; that he does not care whether it is voted up or voted down, as it is simply a question of dollars and cents. Whenever, in any compromise or arrangement or combination that may promise some temporary advantage, we are led upon that ground, then and there the great living principle upon which we have organized as a party is surrendered. The proposition now in our minds that this thing is wrong being once driven out and surrendered, then the institution of slavery necessarily becomes national.

One or two words more of what I did not think of when I arose. Suppose it is true that the Almighty has drawn a line across this continent, on the south side of which part of the people will hold the rest as slaves; that the Almighty ordered this; that it is right, unchangeably right, that men ought there to be held as slaves, and that their fellow men will always have the right to hold them as slaves. I ask you, this once admitted, how can you believe that it is not right for us, or for them coming here, to hold slaves on this other side of the line? Once we come to acknowledge that it is right, that it is the law of the Eternal Being, for slavery to exist on one side of that line, have we any sure ground to object to slaves being held on the other side? Once admit the position that a man rightfully holds another man as property on one side of the line, and you must, when it suits his convenience to come to the other side, admit that he has the same right to hold his property there. Once admit Judge Douglas's proposition and we must all finally give way. Although we may not bring ourselves to the idea that it is to our interest to have slaves in this Northern country, we shall soon bring ourselves to admit that, while we may not want them, if any one else does he has the moral right to have them. Step by step—south of the Judge's moral climate line in the States, then in the Territories everywhere, and then in all the States—it is thus that Judge Douglas would lead us inevitably to the nationalization of slavery. Whether by his doctrine of squatter sovereignty, or by the ground taken by him in his recent speeches in Memphis and through the South—that wherever the climate makes it the interest of the inhabitants to encourage slave property, they will pass a slave code—whether it is covertly nationalized, by Congressional legislation, or by the Dred Scott decision, or by the sophistical and misleading doctrine he has last advanced, the same goal is inevitably reached by the one or the other device. It is only travelling to the same place by different roads.

In this direction lies all the danger that now exists to the Republican cause. I take it that so far as concerns forcibly establishing slavery in the Territories by Congressional legislation, or by virtue of the Dred Scott decision, that day has passed. Our only serious danger is that we shall be led upon this ground of Judge Douglas, on the delusive assumption that it is a good way of whipping our opponents, when in fact, it is a way that leads straight to final surrender. The Republican party should not dally with Judge Douglas when it knows where his proposition and his leadership would take us, nor be disposed to listen to it because it was best somewhere else to support somebody occupying his ground. That is no just reason why we ought to go over to Judge Douglas, as we were called upon to do last year. Never forget that we have before us this whole matter of the right or wrong of slavery in this Union, though the immediate question is as to its spreading out into new Territories and States.

I do not wish to be misunderstood upon this subject of slavery in this country. I suppose it may long exist, and perhaps the best way for it to come to an end peaceably is for it to exist for a length of time. But I say that the spread and strengthening and perpetuation of it is an entirely different proposition. There we should in every way resist it as a wrong, treating it as a wrong, with the fixed idea that it

must and will come to an end. If we do not allow ourselves to be allured from the strict path of our duty by such a device as shifting our ground and throwing ourselves into the rear of a leader who denies our first principle, denies that there is an absolute wrong in the institution of slavery, then the future of the Republican cause is safe and victory is assured. You Republicans of Illinois have deliberately taken your ground; you have heard the whole subject discussed again and again; you have stated your faith, in platforms laid down in a State Convention, and in a National Convention; you have heard and talked over and considered it until you are now all of opinion that you are on a ground of unquestionable right. All you have to do is to keep the faith, to remain steadfast to the right, to stand by your banner. Nothing should lead you to leave your guns. Stand together, ready, with match in hand. Allow nothing to turn you to the right or to the left. Remember how long you have been in setting out on the true course; how long you have been in getting your neighbors to understand and believe as you now do. Stand by your principles; stand by your guns; and victory complete and permanent is sure at the last.

AUSTRALIAN WOMEN.

IMAGINATION pictures a new type in a new land. The pity of it is that the reality falls short of expectation. Australian women, to be sure, work out their destiny in the newest of new lands; but, in these latter days, when one end of the world, so to say, touches the other, originality is heavily handicapped. External influences are for ever beating on Australian shores. American and English examples, always present, are as inimical to the production of original and striking characteristics as civilization, according to Macaulay, is to the production of the most poetic poetry. Australian women aspire to the freedom and independence of American women, and stand in awe of the presence and traditions of English women. The result is a character moulded by conflicting influences reflected through the colored medium of Australian conditions.

Transition stages are rapid in Australia. The twilight flits across the hills and plains, and, ghost-like, disappears. The *naïveté* of childhood slips away before short frocks lengthen into long gowns. It is daylight or darkness, infancy or womanhood here. Before the English girl has outgrown childish delights the Australian is a woman in miniature, self-conscious, self-confident, not easily abashed, with eyes that long since have ceased to look out upon the world with wonder. In a short skirt, with a plait down its back, young Australia imitates its elders, flirts, falls in love, and, sometimes, reads and writes funny little love-letters in all seriousness. Very youthful, very innocent all this in its way, but the way itself strikes one as just a little precocious. Like her brother, the Australian girl has a say as to what she learns, where she goes, what she wears. In fact, she brings herself up under easy supervision. Grown to womanhood, the glitter and glamor of life already tarnished in her sight, she is without reserve, possessed of few illusions and less sentiment. She has arrived at a very good opinion of herself. So far as circumstances permit she pleases herself in the choice of a husband or a course in life. But with all her liberty she does not enjoy the recognized freedom and independence of the American girl.

The social code is slightly confusing. For an unengaged girl to go to the theatre or for a walk alone with a man would be scandalous, but at a dance she may wander about dim gardens and verandas with a new acquaintance and it is quite another thing. She marries at any age short of middle age, but it is not into greater freedom as the French-

woman, but into bondage after the most approved British fashion. Family cares and household duties absorb her; servants worry her. The happy knack of dividing life into parts and sustaining many interests has yet to be acquired. Accomplishments are neglected; dancing goes to the wall; for reading there is no time. But should domesticity fail to engross her and the giddy whirl of society sweep her away from home the household becomes a scene of disorder. Perhaps this is why the average domesticated Australian becomes so uninteresting after marriage. Her life narrows down, she seldom shares her husband's interests, her conversation fluctuates between scandal and servants' delinquencies, fashions and the children. Her days are varied by tea and gossip, with visits and occasional entertainments thrown in. Unless a fashionable woman she no longer troubles to be pretty or charming, and it is unusual for her to keep herself *au courant* of passing events and the questions of to-day, or to give more than an occasional glance at a newspaper.

Though pretty, tall, and well-formed, the Australian is not graceful. Her feet are seldom small, her hands rarely beautiful. Moreover, she does not dress well. Her toilette has none of the *chic* of the Parisienne's, little of the sobriety of the Englishwoman's. Overdressed or dowdy, she produces the impression of not only having little taste, but no artistic sense of the fitness of things. Stylish and elegant women are to be seen more frequently in Melbourne than elsewhere. Nevertheless, dress is dear to the soul of an Australian, and much is spent on it. Down in the lowest social grades it plays an important part. The Australian hugs the idea of equality, and, believing in uniformity of dress as the visible sign of equality, often sacrifices actual comfort to obtain fashionable clothing. An Australian family makes a brave show on holidays. There may be bare feet and rags in the house, but there are cheap feathers and gloves in the street. Here the vanity of the race peeps out and hatred of apparent social distinctions, for vanity is stronger in the Australian woman than ambition, just as indolence is more inherent than energy. She is clever but not intellectual, accomplished oftener than highly educated. To be able to play the piano is regarded as a sort of *cachet* of distinction, not to play it as a lamentable sign of neglected education. Tact is natural to her, also a quick sense of perception. With the ready ease wherewith a troutlet changes its color into harmony with that of its surroundings she adapts herself to circumstances, catches the cue of her *entourage*, and continues to produce a favorable impression. With a cheerful disposition and mercurial temperament the serious side of life scarcely appeals to her. Foreseeing not that to sow the wind is to reap the whirlwind, she exacts neither obedience nor due reverence from her children, and without being specially religious leaves the responsibility of their future very much to Providence. Thus, some of the finest feelings that bind the human race together become destroyed, and a spurious sort of independence loosens family ties in Australian households. Though hardly capable of strong feeling and deep, passionate attachment, the Australian is affectionate, and in manner hospitable, friendly, and, sometimes, sympathetic. Strangers to-day, to-morrow you are intimately acquainted. In friendship there is no tentative stage, but a plunge *in medias res*.

By her speech the Australian betrays her origin. *Bay* is pronounced *bai*; *say*, *sai*. Sometimes there is a nasal sound in the voice. Often there is slang on her lips, not the slang of society merely, but of the stock-yard,

the camp-fire and the stable. It may be heard in the drawing-rooms of society, for polished manners are not found as a matter of course in prominent places. Here men and women are shaken like dice in a box; chance decides the throw. Culture and refinement may dwell in the humblest homes and the veriest plebeianism amidst luxury. Australia is the land of many grotesque contrasts and some unique social surprises.

JULIA F. NICHOLSON.

THE WEAKNESS OF MR. DAVIS'S STRENGTH.

It was to be expected that the recent reinterment of the President of the dead Confederacy would call forth widespread comment. It was not to be expected that any of this could be coldly judicial and wholly unbiased, or yet that the larger portion of it could be free from errors of statement and of deduction. We are still too close to the subject for absolutely accurate portraiture of its real features, for the convulsion which distorted these was too exceptional for its abnormal scars and furrows to be smoothed to naturalness, except by the slow processes of time.

It is doubtful if Mr. Davis's impress upon his era will ever be justly comprehended at a distance from the confined sphere of his most important actions; and it is certain that to this time little of the cold justice of analysis has been given it even by the South, save by the few immediately surrounding the great leader of what outsiders still brand as treason, and we contend was not even rebellion. But to those who closest surrounded Mr. Davis—who acted with, or were influenced by, him in those unparalleled four years—the truth is evident. That one great weakness of the Confederacy was the inexorable personal strength of its leader's character is a fact to be proved by history, paradoxical as it may appear in simple statement. Strong will and prompt decision were character bases of the Mississippi statesman, and both were developed by service in the field and by accidents of political strife. With him a conclusion was an already-assured performance; and while he never "jumped at" conclusions, those arrived at by reason and judgment became irrevocable law for his action.

Success of these methods in his career as a publicist indurated them into concrete parts of his character; and, while ever courteous to dissent and ready to hear the "other side," neither moved the adamant will once set to its cherished purpose. And that this purpose was ever honest, direct and wholly selfless none have yet risen to deny, nor will future history be ever able to prove clearly that it was the wrong one in the main. The analytic thinker may show that the leader's deep interest, nervous industry, and absolute self-reliance caused him to attempt too much, or that he exhausted in details time, energy and resource which might have been left safely to weaker subordinates; for no one brain and set of nerves in one body, could have accomplished fitly one-half of the work that Mr. Davis set himself to do.

It has been charged—North and South, long ago and of late—that through his tenacious adherence to his own peculiar methods, its President caused the downfall of the Southern Confederacy. Indubitably the cold judgment of history will dissolve this error in the acid of fact that the infant government—as Vice-President Stephens had expressed it—"died a-borning"; that its meteoric fall through history might possibly have been less red and blood marked, but might never have been stayed, even

had Mr. Davis been ruled by any advice of the so-called advisers he formally called about him.

But his natural imperious grasp of all subjects had now added to it a keen anxiety for the outcome of the struggle, which grew more intense and morbid as it progressed towards that close which his keen prevision must have seen, but which his indomitable will forcibly rejected. Then, when opposition reared itself before his cherished methods, he set it and the opposer aside, taking his place himself and striving with all his power to act—while he never arrogated—the royal motto: *L'état, c'est moi!*

His rejection of the Hampton Roads conference, so cogently and persistently urged upon Mr. Davis by Alexander H. Stephens, stands boldly forth as witness irrefutable, not of ambition or selfish motive, but of resistless impulse to work out the redemption of his cause by his own methods and with his own hands. The continuance of the war, contrary to the known wish and solemnly urged advice of General Lee, comes quickly to the front to reinforce the first witness; and minor instances might be called *ad infinitum*.

But the very fact that Mr. Davis overruled and carried with him such men as Mr. Stephens and General Lee proves the strength inexorable, the will of adamant, which he assuredly possessed. It proves, too, the keen insight he had into human nature; for these men—even if more far-sighted than himself, and of calmer judgment in weighing the inevitable—he still held to him, while opposed and overridden, with a loyalty that was possibly more personal to the leader of the cause than to the cause itself. For it is not credible that the man lives to-day who could honestly declare his conviction that Mr. Davis was swayed by any selfish ambition, or any petty hope of personal aggrandizement, could he bend Destiny herself to his will.

He was merely a great politician, placed by Fate in a position that had equally conquered the greatest statesman; and he was, besides, an “old-timer” when the great call of his life was made upon his powers. He believed absolutely and unreservedly in that resistless *élan* and unconquerable courage of his nearer countrymen, which had conquered in previous wars—of field and of forum—when he had led them. And as an “old-timer,” though one largely expanded by thought, experience, and study, he could not wake to the bitter knowledge that no war of to-day may be successfully waged with the methods and weapons of yesterday. Nor would he let his more advanced advisers teach him this. He continued to oppose to the progress of advanced thought and aggressive nationality the tough, but feeble, barrier of a moribund system, rivetted by those props only which were fashioned to uphold that system.

One fatal failure was that to grasp in time those new methods of finance which alone could have placed a credit abroad, sufficient for the vast and unreplenished drain that some few thinkers foresaw, when they urged immediate exportation of all cotton, and its storing abroad for use at need. Equally weak was the “foreign policy,” as it was called. Messrs. Benjamin and Mason and Slidell were essentially “old-timers” also. And the new nation's sole appeal to foreign governments—which proverbially have no sympathies—was based upon tiresome appeal to sympathy with an institution of which they were almost universally ignorant; which was contemned wherever they had the faintest inkling of it.

These are examples only; but they point the theory that the aggres-

sively dominant strength of the leader's character—crushing down all opposition and drawing all functions to itself—was largely a weakness in public result. And while this is the truth of history, it is equally a truth that no course of the President, and no ability in his Cabinet surroundings, could have changed one feature of that ugly disguise which Providence was giving to the real blessing of the ending.

For there is no advanced thinker in the South to-day who doubts the outcome of a successful termination of the war between the States, had such been made possible by Europe and the logic of events. A slave-Republic with a white minority scattered over a vast area, border animosities, local jealousies of production and access to the sea, not to mention human ambition, must have split the South into a succession of San Marinos. Severance from mutuality of production, interchange, shared taxation and common protection had else done this from the outside.

Even the oldest of the original pro-slavery men still left in the South have been taught by the indisputable force of facts that the abolition of slavery was an applied lever to her material progress, present no less than future. Fiercely resisting as they did Mr. Lincoln's drastic treatment of the politic disease, reminiscent as they may be of the aggressions upon their beloved States Rights by the old Abolitionists, these old-timers cannot but accept, as younger and quicker thinkers early accepted, this glaring truth: The Emancipation Proclamation declared in larger measure the manumitting of the master from the slave, the freedom of vast natural resource and possibility of production, from their helotry to the cotton delusion.

The Southerner of to-day has long ceased to emulate the ostrich, having no reason to hide his head. He has learned that facts do not change for not being looked squarely in the face. Hence he accepts facts as he sees them; often rejoices in them and more often still utilizes them. But in doing this he loses no jot of loyalty to his own section and to her traditions, because he abates no tittle of his loyalty to the common country, made doubly his by its recementing with blood and fire. Hence he honors no less the memory of that strong, just, brave leader who was ready to give up his life for that cause for which he gave up all besides; suffering yet the more in that his life was spared so long.

The Southerner has no intent to make a saint of Jefferson Davis, but only to bear in memory his courage, his constancy, his indomitable will to work out what he believed would have been the freedom of his brethren and their land. But this respect for the good in the dead leader does not blind the Southern thinker to the fact that his over-confident strength became in some sort weakness; or to the knowledge that merely human will may never strive to override the inevitable.

T. C. DE LEON.